



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 24]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जून 14, 2003/ज्येष्ठ 24, 1925

No. 24]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 2003/JYAISTHA 24, 1925

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय

नई दिल्ली, 4 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1631.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए इनकॉन इम्प्लाइज बेलफेयर एसोसिएशन और अन्य बनाम मैसर्स इनकॉन ग्रुप ऑफ कम्पनीज और अन्य से संबंधित मामले में कम्पनी याचिका संख्या 15/2000 में उच्च न्यायालय, इलाहाबाद, लखनऊ न्यायपीठ, लखनऊ द्वारा पारित आदेश दिनांक 15-01-2003 के अनुसरण में भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. (45) का धारा 120-बी, 406 और 420 के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों तथा उपर्युक्त अपराधों में से एक अथवा अधिक से संबंधित अथवा संसकृत प्रथलों, दुष्प्रेरणों और पड़यत्र तथा उसी संब्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध और अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/45/2003-डी०एस०पी०इ०]

शुभा ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

CABINET SECRETARIAT

New Delhi, the 4th June, 2003

S.O. 1631.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section 1 of Section 5 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government in compliance with order dated: 15-01-2003 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow, in Company Petition No. 15 of 2000, in case of Incon Employees Welfare Association and others Versus M/s. Incon Group of Companies and others, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Uttar Pradesh for investigation of offences punishable under sections 120-B, 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and attempts, abetments and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with one or more of the offence mentioned above and any other offence and offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/45/2003-D.S.P.E.]

SHUBHA THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1632.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए डब्ल्यू पी (सी) सं. 3840/2002 में उच्च न्यायालय, गुवाहाटी, असम के दिनांक 21-11-2002 के आदेश के अनुसार भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) के अधीन पलटन बाजार पुलिस स्टेशन, गुवाहाटी में दर्ज अपराध सं. 155/99 और उपर्युक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और घड़यंत्र तथा उसी संबंधार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध और अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण असम राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/34/2003-डी०एस०पी०इ०]

शुभा ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th June, 2003

S.O. 1632.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government as per Order, dated 21-11-2002 passed by the High Court of Guwahati, Assam, in W.P.(C)-No. 3840 of 2002, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Assam for Investigation of Case No. 155/99 registered at Paltan Bazar Police Station, Guwahati (Assam) under section 364-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and attempt, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with one or more of the offences mentioned above and any other offence committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/34/2003-D.S.P.E.]

SHUBHA THAKUR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1633.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम सं. 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पर्याप्त धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राजस्थान राज्य सरकार के गृह (यूप-व) विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. एफ. 14(5) गृह/यूप-व/2003 जयपुर दिनांक 28 मई, 2003 द्वारा प्राप्त राजस्थान राज्य सरकार की सहमति से पुलिस स्टेशन सांगानेर, जिला जयपुर में दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का अधिनियम सं. 2) की धारा 174 के अधीन दर्ज मामला सं. मार्ग 14/2003 अथवा उसी संबंधार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण राजस्थान राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/50/2003-डी०एस०पी०इ०]

शुभा ठाकुर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th June, 2003

S.O. 1633.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of Government of Rajasthan Home (Group-V) Department, vide Notification No. F. 14(5) Home/Gr-V/2003 Jaipur, dated 28th May 2003, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Rajasthan for investigation of case No. Marg 14/2003 registered at [No. DGIT(E)/Kol-1/80G(2)(a)(iii)2002-2003/4402-06 S.K. Das Gupta Director General of I.T.(E) Police Station Sanganer, District. Jaipur, u/s 174 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974) or offence, if any, committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/50/2003-D.S.P.E.]

SHUBHA THAKUR, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

आय-कर महानिदेशक (छूट)

कोलकाता, 11 अक्टूबर, 2002

का. आ. 1634.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80जी की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (ए) के उपखण्ड (III एफ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्धारित प्राधिकारी अधियुक्त करता है कि उक्त उप-खण्ड के प्रयोजन के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों की पूर्ति करने पर निम्नलिखित शैक्षणिक संस्था राष्ट्रीय महत्व का होगा—

1. विश्वविद्यालय को प्राप्त किए गए दान की राशि का प्रयोग पूर्णतः एवं सिफ़े इसके स्थापित किए जाने के उद्देश्यों पर करेगा।

2. उपरोक्त प्रावधानों के अधीन प्राप्त किए गए दान तथा उसमें दूसे किए गए व्यय की बाबत विश्वविद्यालय पृथक लेखाबहियाँ रखेगी।

3. प्रत्येक लेखा वर्ष के लेखों की एक प्रति लेखा वर्ष की अंतिम तिथि के बाद तक निर्धारित प्राधिकारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत किया जाए।

शैक्षणिक संस्थान का नाम

पेरियार विश्व विद्यालय

सरकारी अभियांत्रिकी महाविद्यालय परिसर

स्लेम—636011

[ज्ञापन सं. आ उप नि (छूट)/कोल-1/80जी (2)(ए) (III एफ) 2002-03/4402-06]

एस०के० दासगुप्ता, आयकर महानिदेशक(छूट)

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Revenue)
DIRECTOR GENERAL OF INCOME-TAX
EXEMPTIONS**

Kolkata, the 11th October, 2002

S.O. 1634—In exercise of the powers conferred by the sub-clause (iii) of clause (a) of Sub-section (2) of Section 80G of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) the prescribed authority hereby notifies the following educational institute of national eminence for the purpose of the said sub-clause, subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- i) the University will apply the amounts of donations received, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established.
- ii) in respect of the donation received under the aforesaid provisions and expenditure made therefrom, the University shall maintain separate accounts :
- iii) a copy of the accounts of each accounting year shall be submitted to the prescribed authority by the 31st December next following the last date of the accounting year.

Name and Educational Institution :

PERIYAR UNIVERSITY,

Government College of Engineering Campus.

Salem - 636 011.

[No. DGIT(E)/Kol-1/80G(2)(a)(iiif)/2002-2003/4402-06]

S.K. DAS GUPTA, Director General of I.T.(E).

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक

(ग्रामीण आयोजना और ऋण विभाग)

मुंबई, 29 अप्रैल, 2003

का. आ. 1635.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 42 की उपधारा (1) के पंतुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा दिनांक अक्टूबर 29, 2002 की अधिसूचनाग्रा आनुचित सं. 417/07-02-05/2002-03 के आशोधन में भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक एतदद्वारा निर्देश देता है कि दिनांक जून 14, 2003 की आरंभ होने वाले पछवाड़े से अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंकों और क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंकों द्वारा अनुरक्षित किया जाने वाला आरक्षित नकदी निधि अनुपात 0.25 प्रतिशत पाइंट से कम कर 4.75 प्रतिशत से 4.50 प्रतिशत कर दिया जाए।

तथापि, सभी अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंकों और क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंकों द्वारा कुल मांग और मीयादी देयताओं पर अनुरक्षित प्रभावी आरक्षित नकदी निधि अनुपात पूर्वोक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत किये गये निर्धारण के अनुसार 3.0 प्रतिशत से कम नहीं हो।

[संदर्भ .ग्रआञ्चित.सं.973/07-02-05/2002-03]

उपा थोरात, कार्यपालक निदेशक

**RESERVE BANK OF INDIA
(Rural Planning & Credit Department)**

Mumbai, the 29th April, 2003

S. O. 1635.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to Sub-section (1) of Section 42 of Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934) and in modification of notification RPCD. No. 417/07.02.05/2002-03 dated October 29, 2002, the Reserve Bank of India hereby directs that the Cash Reserve Ratio (CRR) required to be maintained by Scheduled State Co-operative Banks and Regional Rural Banks shall be reduced by 0.25 percentage point from 4.75 per cent to 4.50 per cent effective from the fortnight beginning June 14, 2003.

However, the effective CRR maintained by all Scheduled State Co-operative Banks and Regional Rural Banks on total demand and time liabilities shall not be less than 3.0 per cent as stipulated under the Act, ibid.

[No. RPCD. No. 973/07-02-05/2002-03]

USHA THORAT, Executive Director

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 30 अप्रैल, 2003

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1636—सामान्य जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार अधोलिखित संगठन को उसके नाम के सामने उल्लिखित अवधि के लिए आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 6 के साथ परिवर्त आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रयोजनार्थ संस्था श्रेणी के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन अनुमोदित करती है :—

- (i) अधिसूचित संस्था अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियों का रख-रखाव करेगा,
- (ii) अधिसूचित संस्था प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपनी वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान गति-विधियों की वार्षिक रिटर्न प्रत्येक 31 मई को अथवा उससे पहले सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग 'टेक्नोलाजी भवन न्यू महरोली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को प्रस्तुत करेगा,
- (iii) अधिसूचित संस्था केन्द्र सरकार की तरफ से नामोदिष्ट निर्धारण अधिकारी को आयकर की विवरण प्रस्तुत करने के अतिरिक्त अपने लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों की एक प्रति तथा अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों जिसके लिए आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत छूट प्रदान की गई थी, के संबंध में आय एवं व्यय खाते की लेखा परीक्षा की भी एक प्रति

संस्था पर अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) 10 मिडलटन रोड, पांचवा तल, कलकत्ता-700071 (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक एवं औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग तथा (ग) आयकर आयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (छूट) को प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 अक्टूबर को अथवा उससे पहले प्रस्तुत करेगा।

क्रम अनुमोदित संगठन का नाम सं.	अधिकारी जिसके लिए अधिसूचना प्रभावी है
1. फाउंडेशन फॉर रिवाइटलाइ-	2-11-2000 से 31-3-2003

जेशन ऑफ लोकल हैल्थ ट्रेडिशन्स,
50, एम.एस.एच. लेआउट, द्वितीय
स्टेज, तृतीय मेन द्वितीय क्रॉस आनन्द
नगर, बंगलौर-560024

टिप्पणी : — अधिसूचित संस्था को सलाह दी जाती है कि वे अनुमोदन के नवीकरण के लिए तीन प्रतियों में और पहले ही अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) के माध्यम से केन्द्र सरकार को आवेदन करें अनुमोदन के नवीकरण के लिए आवेदन पत्र की तीन प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को सीधे भेजो जाएंगी।

[अधिसूचना सं. 95/2003/F. No. 203/38/2002-आयकर नि.-II]

संगीता गुप्ता, निदेशक (आयकर नि.-II)

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

Central Board of Direct Taxes.

New Delhi, the 30th April, 2003

(INCOME TAX)

S. O. 1636.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Central Government for the period mentioned against the name, for the purpose of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income Tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6 of the Income Tax Rules, 1962 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) The notified Institution shall maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) The notified Institution shall furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year on or before 31st May of each year;
- (iii) The notified Institution shall submit, on behalf of the Central Government, to (a) the

Director General of Income tax (Exemptions), 10 Middleton Row, 5th Floor, Kolkatta-700071 (b) the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) the Commissioner of Income tax/Director of Income tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, on or before the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income & Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of section 35 of Income tax Act, 1961 in addition to the return of income tax to the designated assessing officer.

S.No.	Name of the organisation approved	Period for which Notification is effective
1.	Foundation for Revitalisation of Local Health Traditions,	2-11-2000 to 31-3-2003
50.	MSH Layout, 2nd Stage	
3rd Main, 2nd Cross Ananda-nagar, Bangalore-560024		

Notes:—The notified Institution is advised to apply in triplicates and well in advance for renewal of the approval, to the Central Government through the Commissioner of Income tax Director of Income tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction. Three copies of application for renewal of approval shall also be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[Notification No. 95/2003/F. No. 203/38/2002/ITA-II]

SANGEETA GUPTA, Director (ITA-II)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अप्रैल, 2003

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1637—सामान्य जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार अधिसूचित संगठन को उसके नाम के सामने उल्लिखित अधिकार के लिए आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 6 के सम्बन्ध परिवर्त आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (i) के प्रयोजनार्थ 'संघ' श्रेणी के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन अनुमोदित करती है :—

- (i) अधिसूचित संघ अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलारों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियों का रख-रखाव करेगा,
- (ii) अधिसूचित संस्था प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपनी वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान गति-विधियों की वार्षिक रिटर्न प्रत्येक 31 मई को अथवा उससे पहले सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग टेक्नोलॉजी भवन न्यू महरेली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को प्रस्तुत करेगा,
- (iii) अधिसूचित संघ केन्द्र सरकार की तरफ से नामोदिष्ट निर्धारण अधिकारी को आयकर की विवादी प्रस्तुत करने

के अतिरिक्त अपने लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों की एक प्रति तथा अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों जिसके लिए आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत छूट प्रदान की गई थी, के संबंध में आय एवं व्यय खाते की लेखा परीक्षा की भी एक प्रति संस्था पर अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) 10 मिडलटन रो, पांचवां तल, कलकत्ता-700071। (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक एवं औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग तथा (ग) आयकर आयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (छूट) को प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 अक्टूबर को अथवा उससे पहले प्रस्तुत करेगा।

क्रम सं.	अनुमोदित संगठन का नाम	अवधि जिसके लिए अधिसूचना प्रभावी है
1.	मैसर्स आई सिर्च फाउंडेशन 180, एन.एस.के. सालै, वडापालानी चेन्नई-600026	1-4-2002 से 31-3-2003

टिप्पणी :—अधिसूचित संघ को सलाह दी जाती है कि वे अनुमोदन के नवीकरण के लिए तीन प्रतियों में और पहले ही अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) के माध्यम से केन्द्र सरकार को आवेदन करें। अनुमोदन के नवीकरण के लिए आवेदन पत्र की तीन प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को सीधे भेंजी जाएंगी।

[अधिसूचना सं. 101/2003/फा.सं. 203/92/2002-आयकर नि-II]

संगीता गुप्ता, निदेशक (आयकर नि.-II)

New Delhi, the 30th April, 2003

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1637.—It is hereby notified for general information the Ac organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Central Government for the period mentioned against the name, for the purpose of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category "Association" subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) The notified Association shall maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities;
- (ii) The notified Association shall furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year on or before 31st May of each year;
- (iii) The notified Association shall submit, on behalf of the Central Government, to (a) the

Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions) 10 Middleton Row, 5th Floor, Kolkatta-700071 (b) the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) the Commissioner of Income tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, on or before the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income & Expenditure Account in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income tax Act, 1961 in addition to the return of income tax to the designated assessing officer.

S.No.	Name of the organisation	Period for which approval	Notification is effective
1.	M/s. The Eye Research Foundation, 180, NSK Salai, Vadapalani, Chennai-600026	1-4-2002 to 31-3-2005	

Note:—The notified Association is advised to apply in triplicates and well in advance for renewal of the approval, to the Central Government through the Commissioner of Income-tax Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction. Three copies of application for renewal of approval shall also be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[Notification No. 101/2003/F. No. 203/92/2002/ITA-II]

SANGEETA GUPTA, Director (ITA-II)

नई दिल्ली, 6 मई, 2003

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1638—सामान्य जानकारी के लिए वह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार अधोलिखित संगठन को उसके नाम के सामने उल्लिखित अवधि के लिए आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 6 के साथ पटित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रयोजनार्थ "संस्था" श्रेणी के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन अनुमोदित करती है :—

- (i) अनुसूचित संस्था अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियों का रख-रखाव करेगा;
- (ii) अनुसूचित संस्था प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपनी वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान गति विधियों की वार्षिक रिटर्न प्रत्येक 31 मई को अथवा उससे पहले सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग 'टेक्नोलॉजी भवन' न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को प्रस्तुत करेगा;
- (iii) अनुसूचित संस्था केन्द्र सरकार की तरफ से नामोदिष्ट निर्धारण अधिकारी को आयकर की विवरण प्रस्तुत करने के अतिरिक्त अपने लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों की एक प्रति तथा अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों जिसके लिए आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा

(1) के अन्तर्गत छूट प्रदान की गई थी, के संबंध में आय एवं व्यय खाते की लेखा परीक्षा की भी एक प्रति संस्था पर अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले (क) आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) 10 मिडलटन रोड, पांचवा तल, कलकत्ता-700071 (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक एवं औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग तथा (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) को प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 अक्टूबर को अथवा उससे पहले प्रस्तुत करेगा।

क्रम अनुमोदित संगठन का नाम सं.	अवधि जिसके लिए अधिसूचना प्रभावी है
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

1. नेशनल हैल्थ एण्ड एज्यूकेशन सोसाइटी 1-4-2002 से 31-3-2005
वीर सावरकर मार्ग, माहिम,
मुम्बई-400016

टिप्पणी :—अधिसूचित संस्था को सलाह दी जाती है कि वे अनुमोदन के नवीकरण के लिए तीन प्रतियों में और पहले ही अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) के माध्यम से केन्द्र सरकार को आवेदन करें अनुमोदन के नवीकरण के लिए आवेदन पत्र की तीन प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को सीधे भेजी जाएंगी।

[अधिसूचना सं. 113/2003/फा.सं. 203/22/2003-आयकर नि.-II]

संगीता गुप्ता, निदेशक (आयकर नि.-II)

New Delhi, the 6th May, 2003

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1638.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Central Government for the period mentioned against the name, for the purpose of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6 of the Income tax Rules, 1962 under the category "Institution" subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) The notified Institution shall maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities,
- (ii) The notified Institution shall furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, 'Technology Bhawan', New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110016 for every financial year on or before 31st May of each year;
- (iii) The notified Institution shall submit, on behalf of the Central Government, to (a) the Director General of Income-tax (Exemptions), 10 Middleton Row, 5th Floor, Kolkata-700071 (b) the Secretary, Department of Scientific &

Industrial Research, and (c) the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, on or before the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income & Expenditure Accounts in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of Section 35 of Income-tax Act, 1961 in addition to the return of income tax to the designated assessing officer.

S.No.	Name of the organisation	Period for which approved	Period for which Notification is effective
1.	National Health and Education Society, Veer Savarkar Marg, Mahim, Mumbai-400016	1-4-2002 to 31-3-2005	

Note:—The notified Institution is advised to apply in triplicates and well in advance for renewal of the approval, to the Central Government through the Commissioner of Income-tax/Director of Income-tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction. Three copies of application for renewal of approval shall also be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[Notification No. 113/2003/F. No. 203/22/2003/ITA-II]

SANGEETA GUPTA, Director (ITA-II)

वित्त एवं कल्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1639.—गोवा, दमन एवं दीव (बैंक पुनर्गठन) विनियमावली, 1962 के विनियम 4(1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा भारतीय स्टेट बैंक में अधिकारी, सहायक प्रबंधक (जेएमजीएस-I) श्री महेश कुमार जी० पारेख को दिनांक 19-4-2003 से तीन वर्ष की अवधि अर्थात् 18-04-2006 तक के लिए बैंकों नेश्योनेल अल्ट्रामारीनों एंड कइस्का इकनोमिका डी गोवा के अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 20/1/2002-बी०ओ०ए०]

डॉ० चौधरी, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 7th May, 2003

S. O. 1639.—In exercise of the powers conferred under regulation 4(1) of the Goa, Daman & Diu (Banks

Reconstruction) Regulations 1962, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Mahesh Kumar G. Parekh, Officer, Assistant Manager (JMGS I) in the State Bank of India, as the Custodian of Banco Nacional Ultramarino and Caixa Economica de Goa w.e.f. 19-4-2003, for a period of three years i.e. upto 18-04-2006.

[F. No. 20/1/2002-BOA]

D. CHOUDHURY, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 2 जून, 2003

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1640—सामान्य जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार अधोलिखित संगठन को उसके नाम के सामने लिलिखित अवधि के लिए आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 6 के साथ परित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रयोजनार्थ “संघ” श्रेणी के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन अनुमोदित करती है :—

- (i) अनुसूचित संघ अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों के लिए अलग लेखा बहियों का रख-रखाव करेगा;
- (ii) अनुसूचित संघ प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपनी वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान गति विधियों की वार्षिक रिटर्न प्रत्येक 31 मई को अथवा उससे पहले सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग “टेक्नोलॉजी भवन” न्यू महरौली रोड, नई दिल्ली-110016 को प्रस्तुत करेगा;
- (iii) अनुसूचित संघ केन्द्र सरकार की तरफ से नामोदिष्ट निर्धारण अधिकारी को आयकर की विवरण प्रस्तुत करने के अतिरिक्त अपने लेखा परीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों की एक प्रति तथा अपने अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों जिसके लिए आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत छूट प्रदान की गई थी, के संबंध में आय एवं व्यय खाते की लेखा परीक्षा की भी एक प्रति संस्था पर अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले (क) आयकर महानिदंशक (छूट) 10 मिडिलटन रो, पांचवा तल, कलकत्ता-700071 (ख) सचिव, वैज्ञानिक एवं औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग तथा (ग) आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) को प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 अक्टूबर को अथवा उससे पहले प्रस्तुत करेगा।

क्रम अनुमोदित संगठन का नाम सं.	अवधि जिसके लिए अधिसूचना प्रभावी है
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

1. मैसर्स फ्लूड कंट्रोल सिर्च इस्टीट्यूट 1-4-2002 से 31-3-2005
कांजीकाड़, वेस्ट पालघाट,
केरल-678623

टिप्पणी :—अधिसूचित संघ को सलाह दी जाती है कि वे अनुमोदन के नवोकरण के लिए तीन प्रतियों में और पहले ही अधिकार क्षेत्र वाले आयकर आयुक्त/आयकर निदेशक (छूट) के माध्यम से केन्द्र सरकार को आवेदन करें। अनुमोदन के नवोकरण के लिए आवेदन पत्र की तीन प्रतियां सचिव, वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग को सीधे भेजी जाएंगी।

[अधिसूचना सं. 141/2003/फा.सं. 203/8/2003-आयकर नि.-II]

संगीता गुप्ता, निदेशक (आयकर नि.-II)

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 2nd June, 2003

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1640.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation mentioned below has been approved by the Central Government for the period mentioned against the name, for the purpose of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6 of the Income tax Rules, 1962 under the category “Association” subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) The notified Association shall maintain separate books of accounts for its research activities.
- (ii) The notified Association shall furnish the Annual Return of its scientific research activities to the Secretary, Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, ‘Technology Bhawan’, New Mehrauli Road, New Dethi-110016 for every financial year on or before 31st May of each year.
- (iii) The notified Association shall submit, on behalf of the Central Government, to (a) the Director General of Income tax (Exemptions), 10 Middleton Row, 5th Floor, Kolkata-700071 (b) the Secretary Department of Scientific & Industrial Research, and (c) the Commissioner of Income tax/Director of Income tax (Exemptions), having jurisdiction over the organisation, on or before the 31st October each year, a copy of its audited Annual Accounts and also a copy of audited Income & Expenditure Accounts in respect of its research activities for which exemption was granted under sub-section (1) of section 35 of Income tax Act, 1961 in addition to the return of income tax to the designated assessing officer.

S.No.	Name of the organisation Approved	Period for which Notification is effective
1.	M/s Fluid Control Research Institute Kanjikode West, Palghat, Kerala-678623	1-4-2002 to 31-3-2005

Notes:—The notified Association is advised to apply in triplicates and well in advance for renewal of the approval to the Central Government through the Commissioner of Income tax/Director of Income tax (Exemptions) having jurisdiction. Three copies of application for renewal of approval shall also be sent directly to the Secretary, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

[Notification No. 141/2003/F. No. 203/8/2003/ITA-II]

SANGEETA GUPTA, Director (ITA-II)

विदेश मंत्रालय

(सी. पी. वी. प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1641.—राजनयिक कोंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41 वाँ) की धारा 2 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, एटदूतावास आविदजान में श्री आनन्दमय वैथ सहायक को 30-05-2003 से सहायक कोंसली अधिकारी का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. टी.-4330/01/2003]

उपेन्द्र सिंह रावत, अवर सचिव (कौन्सलर)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

(C.P.V. Division)

New Delhi, the 30th May, 2003

S.O. 1641.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorise Shri Anandamay Baidya, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Abidjan to perform the duties of Assistant Consular Officer with effect from 30-05-2003.

[No. T.-4330/01/2003]

U.S. RAWAT, Under Secy. (Cons.)

वाणिज्य एवं उद्योग मंत्रालय

(वाणिज्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 2 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1642.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में वाणिज्य विभाग के अंतर्गत आने वाले निम्नलिखित

कार्यालयों को अधिसूचित करती है, जिसके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारिवृद्धि ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाथक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है :—

- भारतीय निर्यात ऋण गारंटी निगम लिमिटेड
रहेजा टावर्स, पश्चिमी विंग
11वीं मंजिल, 26 एम जी रोड,
बैंगलूर-560001
- भारतीय निर्यात ऋण गारंटी लिमिटेड
ओपल रल काम्पलैक्स
पहली मंजिल, 315-सी 34,
वृन्दावन रोड, सलैम-636004
- मेप्स विशेष आर्थिक क्षेत्र, तमिलनाडु, पांडिचेरी
अंडमान और निकोबार द्वीप समूह के शत-प्रतिशत
निर्यात अभियुक्त एकक,
प्रशासनिक कार्यालय भवन
राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग-45, ताम्बरम,
चेन्नई-600 045

[सं. ई.-11013/3/99-हिन्दी]

एल. पी. सैनी, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

(Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 2nd June, 2003

S.O. 1642.—In pursuance of sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices whereof more than 80% Staff have acquired a working knowledge of Hindi :—

- Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Ltd.
Reheja Towers, West Wing
11th Floor, 26 M.G. Road
Bangalore-560 001.
- Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Ltd.
Opel Ratna Complex
1st Floor, 315-C 34,
Vrindavan Road,
Salem-636 004.
- MEPZ SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONE &
HEOUS in Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry,
Andaman & Nicobar Island
Administrative Office Building,
National Highway-45,
Tambaram, Chennai-600 045.

[No. E-11013/3/99-Hindi]

L.P. SAINI, Director (O.L.)

कोयला मंत्रालय
नई दिल्ली, 30 मई, 2003

का.आ. का.आ. 1643.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है, कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस क्षेत्र में कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है;

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. एस.ई.सी.एल./ बी.एस.पी./ जी.एम./ (पी.एल.जी.)/ भूमि/264 तारीख 6 नवम्बर, 2002 का निरीक्षण कलेक्टर कोरबा (छत्तीसगढ़) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता - 700 001 के कार्यालय में या साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग), सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर - 495006 के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाली भूमि में, हितबद्ध सभी व्यक्ति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट सभी नक्शों, चार्ट्स और अन्य दस्तावेजों को इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से, नब्बे दिन के भीतर भार साधक अधिकारी/विभागाध्यक्ष (राजस्व), साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर - 495 006 (छत्तीसगढ़) को भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची
ढेलवाडीह दूसरा विस्तार खंड
कोरबा कोलफील्ड्स
जिला - कोरबा (छत्तीसगढ़)

(रेखांक सं.एस.ई.सी.एल./बी.एस.पी./जी.एम./
(पी.एल.जी.)/भूमि/264 तारीख 6 नवम्बर, 2002
(पूर्वक्षण के लिए अधिसूचित भूमि दर्शाते हुए)

ब्लाक क

क्रम सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी हल्का सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1.	अभयपुर	41	कटघोरा	कोरबा	17.560	भाग
2	ढेलवाडीह	42	कटघोरा	कोरबा	28.834	भाग

कुल 46.394 हेक्टर (लगभग)

सीमा वर्णन:

- क - ख** रेखा ग्राम ढेलवाडीह में बिन्दु क से आरंभ होती है और ढेलवाडीह, अभयपुर ग्राम से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु ख पर मिलती है।
- ख - क** रेखा अभयपुर, ढेलवाडीह ग्रामों से होकर जाती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु क पर मिलती है।

अनुसूची निरन्तर

ब्लाक ख

क्रम सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी हल्का सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1	देलवाड़ीह	42	कटघोरा	कोरबा	9.883	भाग
2	ढबढब	42	कटघोरा	कोरबा	24.112	भाग
3	अरदा	48	कटघोरा	कोरबा	7.495	भाग
कुल : 41.490 हेक्टर (लगभग)						
ब्लाक क + ख = कुल योग : 87.884 हेक्टर (लगभग)						
या 217.16 एकड़ (लगभग)						

सीमा वर्णन:

ग - घ रेखा ग्राम देलवाड़ीह में बिन्दु ग से आरंभ होती है और देलवाड़ीह, ढबढब अरदा ग्रामों से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु घ पर मिलती है।

घ - ग रेखा अरदा, ढबढब, देलवाड़ीह ग्रामों से होकर जाती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु ग पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. -43015/13/2002-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

संजय बहादुर, उप सचिव

Ministry of Coal

New Delhi, 30th May, 2003

S.O S.O. 1643.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the Schedule hereto annexed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957(20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein.

The plan bearing Number: SECL/BSP/GM(PLG)/LAND/264 dated 6th November , 2002 of the area covered by this notification can be inspected in the Office of the Collector, Korba (Chhattisgarh) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata – 700 001 or in the Office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Seepat Road, Bilaspur – 495006 (Chhattisgarh) .

All persons interested in the land covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Officer-in-Charge/Head of the Department (Revenue), South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Bilaspur – 495006 (Chhattisgarh) within ninety days from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

Schedule**Dhelwadih 2nd Extension Block****Korba Coalfields, District-Korba (Chhattisgarh)**

**Plan No. SECL/BSP/GM(Plg)/Land/264
dated 6th November, 2002
(Showing the land for prospecting)**

Block -'A'

Serial number	Name of village	Patwarih halka number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Abhaipur	41	Katghora	Korba	17.560	Part
2	Dhelwadih	42	Katghora	Korba	28.834	Part
Total :46.394 hectares (approximately)						

Boundary Description:

A-B Line starts from point "A" in village Dhelwadih and passes through villages Dhelwadih, Abhaipur and meets at point "B".

B-A Line passes through villages Abhaipur, Dhelwadih and meet at the starting point "A".

Block - 'B'.

Serial number	Name of village	Patwarih halka number	Tahsil'	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Dhelwadih	42	Katghora	Korba	9.883	Part
2	Dhabdhab	42	Katghora	Korba	24.112	Part
3	Arda	48	Katghora	Korba	7.495	Part
Total:41.490 hectares(approximately)						
Block A+B = Grand total : 87.884 hectares(approximately) or 217.16 acres (approximately)						

Boundary Description:

C-D Line starts from point 'C' in village Dhelwadih and passes through villages Dhelwadih, Dhabdhab, Arda and meets at point 'D'.

D-C Line passes through village Arda, Dhabdhab, Dhelwadih and meets at the starting point at 'C'.

नई दिल्ली, 4 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1644.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (i) के अधीन निकाली गई और भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 11 अगस्त, 2001 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का.आ. 1970, तारीख 31 जुलाई, 2001 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में, विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में, जिसका माप 2364,718 हैक्टर (लगभग) या 5843.22 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमि के भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा(1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है:-

(क) इससे संलग्न अनुसूची "क" में वर्णित 0.884 हैक्टर (लगभग) या 2.18 एकड़ (लगभग) माप की भूमि ;

(ख) इससे संलग्न अनुसूची "ख" में वर्णित 652.874 हैक्टर (लगभग) या 1613.25 एकड़ (लगभग) माप की भूमि में खनिज प्राप्त करने, उन पर कार्य करने और ले जाने के लिए खनन, वेधन, खुदाई और पता लगाने के अधिकार ;

टिप्पण 1 इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. एसईसीएल/बीएसपी /जीएम(पीएलजी)/भूमि/261 तारीख 29 मई, 2002 का निरीक्षण कलेक्टर, शहडोल (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700 001 के कार्यालय में या साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिलो (राजस्व अनुभाग), सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर - 495 006 (छत्तीसगढ़) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

टिप्पण 2 उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध है:-

'अर्जन के प्रति आक्षेप:-'

8 (1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आक्षेप कर सकता है।

स्पष्टीकरण:- इस धारा के अर्थान्तर्गत यह आक्षेप नहीं समझा जाएगा कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और यह कि ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में किया जाएगा और सक्षम प्राधिकारी, आक्षेपकर्ता को स्वयं या किसी विधि व्यवसायी के द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसे सभी आक्षेपों की सुनवाई के पश्चात और ऐसी और जांच, यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात जो वह आवश्यक समझे वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि या उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में केन्द्रीय सरकार को एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में विभिन्न रिपोर्टें, आक्षेपों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाहियों के अभिलेख सहित उक्त सरकार के विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए, वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा, जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता यदि इस अधिनियम के अधीन भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार अर्जित किए जाते।

टिप्पण 3 - केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता - 700 001, को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 4 अप्रैल, 1987 के पृष्ठ 1397 से 1400 पर प्रकाशित अधिसूचना का.आ. 905, तारीख 20 मार्च, 1987 द्वारा सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया गया है।

अनुसूची - "क"
 खेरहा ब्लाक
 सोहागपुर क्षेत्र
 जिला - शहडोल (मध्य प्रदेश)

सभी अधिकार

क्र.सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी हल्का	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र(हैक्टर में)	टिप्पण
		सं.				
1.	कन्दोहा	93	सोहागपुर	शहडोल	0.884	भाग

योग - 0.884 हैक्टर (लगभग)

या

2.18 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम कन्दोहा (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्यांक:

131, 132(भाग), 134(भाग), 135(भाग), 136(भाग)

सीमा वर्णन -

घ - घ1-घ2-घ3 रेखा बिन्दु ग्राम कन्दोहा में बिन्दु "घ" से आरंभ होती है और संख्या 132 की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ तब प्लाट संख्या 132 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 131 की उत्तरी सीमा, प्लाट संख्या 131, 136 की पश्चिमी सीमा होते हुई जाती है और बिन्दु "घ 3" पर मिलती है ।

घ 3 - घ रेखा प्लाट संख्या 136, 135, 134 से होते हुई जाती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है ।

अनुसूची "ख"
 खेरहा खंड
 सोहागपुर क्षेत्र
 जिला - शहडोल (मध्य प्रदेश)

खनन अधिकार

क्र.सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी हल्का सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हैक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1.	खैरहा	93	सोहागपुर	शहडोल	338.608	भाग
2.	खन्नाथ	93	सोहागपुर	शहडोल	197.613	भाग
3.	कन्दोहा	93	सोहागपुर	शहडोल	116.653	भाग
योग:-					652.874	हैक्टर (लगभग) या 1613.25एकड़(लगभग)

1. ग्राम खैरहा (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्यांक -

2(भाग), 3, 4(भाग), 5(भाग), 6से50, 51(भाग), 52(भाग), 53/1(भाग), 53/2, 55(भाग), 56 से 175, 176(भाग), 177 से 182, 183(भाग), 184(भाग), 187 से 192, 196, 199 से 204, 205(भाग), 206 से 252, 269 से 315, 327, 493(भाग), 497 से 500, 504 से 509 ।

2. ग्राम खन्नाथ (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्यांक -

32 से 38, 39(भाग), 42(भाग), 43(भाग), 74 से 84, 115(भाग), 116से 147, 148/1, 148/2, 148/3, 149 से 190, 191(भाग), 192(भाग), 193 से 217, 218(भाग), 220 से 492, 493(भाग), 494 से 497, 498(भाग), 499(भाग), 500(भाग), 501, 1138 से 1162, 1164(भाग), 1165(भाग), 1166(भाग), 1167से1222, 1223(भाग), 1225(भाग), 1226(भाग), 1227(भाग), 1228(भाग), 1229 से1242, 1243(भाग), 1244(भाग), 1245(भाग), 1246(भाग), 1247(भाग), 1248(भाग), 1249से 1266, 1269(भाग) ।

3. ग्राम कन्दोहा (भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्यांक -

1(भाग), 3(भाग), 4से23, 24/1, 24/2, 25से115, 125से130, 132(भाग), 133, 143 से148, 155(भाग), 156(भाग), 157, 158(भाग), 159से161, 162(भाग), 163(भाग), 164(भाग), 165, 166(भाग), 167 (भाग), 168(भाग), 169(भाग), 177(भाग), 178(भाग), 3 91/3(भाग), 115/411(भाग) ।

सीमा वर्णन:

क-ख रेखा ग्राम खन्नाथ में बिन्दु 'क' से आरंभ होती है और प्लाट संख्या 191, 181, 169, 32, 33, 34 की उत्तरी सीमा के साथ-साथ प्लाट संख्या 32, 42 के

मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 38 की उत्तरी सीमा प्लाट संख्या 39 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 74,76,84 की उत्तरी सीमा से होते हुए जाती है और बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।

ख-ख 1 रेखा प्लाट संख्या 84,83,82,80 की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ प्लाट संख्या 115,500 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 501 की पूर्वी सीमा प्लाट संख्या 498,493 के मध्य से प्लाट संख्या 1139,1138,1151,1152,1153, 1155, 1156, 1162, 1164 की उत्तरी सीमा, प्लाट संख्या 1164,1165,1166 के मध्य से प्लाट संख्यांक 1266, 1265 की पूर्वी सीमा प्लाट संख्या 1269,1248,1247, 1246,1245,1244,1243,1228,1227,1226,1225,1223 के मध्य से होते हुए जाती है और खैरहा और खन्नाथ ग्रामों की सम्मिलित सीमा पर बिन्दु 'ख 1' पर मिलती है।

ख 1 - ग रेखा ग्राम खैरहा में प्लाट संख्या 176,183,184 के मध्य से प्लाट संख्या 182, 187, 192, 196, 201, 200,199,203 की पूर्वी सीमा के पश्चात कन्दोहा ग्राम में प्रवेश करती है और प्लाट संख्या 1 के मध्य से प्लाट संख्या 4 की उत्तरी सीमा, प्लाट संख्या 3 के मध्य से जाती है तब बैसाहा नाला के मध्य से होते हुई जाती है और बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।

ग - घ रेखा बैसाहा नाला से निकलने के पश्चात ग्राम कन्दोहा में प्रवेश करती है और प्लाट संख्या 391/3, 167, 166,168,169,164,177,163,162,178, 158,155,156 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 147, 148 की पूर्वी सीमा, प्लाट संख्या 148,147,133 की दक्षिणी सीमा से होते हुई जाती है और बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती हैं।

ग1-घ1-घ2-घ3 रेखा सभी अधिकार क्षेत्र सीमा वर्णनानुसार जाती है और बिन्दु 'घ3' पर मिलती है।

घ3-ड.-च रेखा प्लाट संख्या 129 की पूर्वी सीमा प्लाट संख्या 129, 125 की दक्षिणी सीमा के साथ-साथ, प्लाट संख्या 411 के मध्य से नाला से होते हुए जाती है और ग्राम खैरहा में प्रवेश करती है और प्लाट संख्या 205 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 509,508,504,500,497 की दक्षिणी सीमा, प्लाट संख्या 493 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 250,251,252, 245, 244, 271, 270, 269,299,327,303,304,315,313,55 की दक्षिणी सीमा से होते हुई जाती है और बिन्दु "च" पर मिलती है।

च-क रेखा ग्राम खेरहा के प्लाट संख्या 55,53/1 के मध्य से, प्लाट संख्या 53/2 की पश्चिमी सीमा, तब प्लाट संख्या 53/1, 52,51,2,4,5 के मध्य से होते हुए ग्राम खन्नाथ में प्रवेश करती है और प्लाट संख्यांक 218 के मध्य से प्लाट संख्या 194 की पश्चिमी सीमा, प्लाट संख्यांक 192,191 के मध्य से होते हुए जाती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. -43015/8/2001-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

संजय बहादुर, उप सचिव

New Delhi, 4th June, 2003

S. O. 1644.— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal, number S.O. 1970 dated the 31st July, 2001, issued under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957)(hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and published in Part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 11th August, 2001, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 2364.718 hectares (approximately) or 5843.22 acres (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the following lands:-

- (a) The lands measuring 0.884 hectares (approximately) or 2.18 acres (approximately) described in Schedule 'A' appended hereto;
- (b) The right to mine, quarry, bore, dig, and search for, win, work and carry away minerals in the lands measuring 652.874 hectares (approximately) or 1613.25 acres (approximately) described in the Schedule 'B' appended hereto;

Note 1 - The plan bearing No:SECL/BSP/GM(Plg)/Land/261 dated 29th May, 2002 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta 700 001 or in the Office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Seepat Road, Bilaspur-495 006 (Chhattisgarh)

Note 2- Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the said Act, which provides as follows:-

"8 Objection to Acquisition.- (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation.- It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2). Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing, and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further inquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of the proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

(3). For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act.”.

Note:3 The Coal Controller,1, Council House Street, Calcutta 700 001 has been appointed by the Central Government, as the competent authority under section 3 of the said Act, vide notification under S.O 905, dated the 20th March, 1987, published in Part-II, Section – 3 , Sub-section(ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 4th April, 1987 at pages 1397 to 1400.

Schedule – 'A'

Khairha Block,Sohagpur Area

District – Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh)

All rights

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari halka number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Kandoha	93	Sohagpur	Shahdol	0.884	Part
Total: 0.884 hectares (approximately) or 2.18 acres (approximately)						

1. Plot numbers to be acquired in village Kandoha(Part)

131,132(Part),134(Part),135(Part),136(Part).

Boundary description.

- D-D1- Line starts from point 'D' in village Kandoha and passes along
 D2-D3 the Eastern boundary of plot number 132, then through plot number
 132, Northern boundary of plot number 131, Western boundary of plot
 number 131,136 and meets at point 'D3'.
 D3-D Line passes through plot numbers 136, 135, 134 and meets at point
 starting point 'D'.

Schedule 'B'

Khairha Block, Sohagpur Area
District- Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh)

Mining rights.

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari halka number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Khairha	93	Sohagpur	Shahdol	338.608	Part
2	Khannath	93	Sohagpur	Shahdol	197.613	Part
3	Kandoha	93	Sohagpur	Shahdol	116.653	Part
Total: 652.874 hectares (approximately) or 1613. 25 acres (approximately)						

1. **Plot numbers to be acquired in village Khairha (Part)**
 2(Pat),3,4(Part),5(Part),6 to 50, 51(Part), 52(Part), 53/1(Part), 53/2, 55(Part), 56 to 175, 176(Part), 177 to 182, 183(Part), 184(Part), 187 to 192, 196, 199 to 204, 205(Part), 206 to 252, 269 to 315, 327, 493(Part), 497 to 500, 504 to 509.
2. **Plot numbers to be acquired in village Khannath (Part)**
 32 to 38, 39(Part), 42(Part), 43(Part), 74 to 84, 115(Part), 116 to 147, 148/1, 148/2, 148/3, 149 to 190, 191(Part), 192(Part), 193 to 217, 218(Part), 220 to 492, 493(Part), 494 to 497, 498(Part), 499, 500(Part), 501, 1138 to 1162, 1164(Part), 1165(Part), 1166(Part), 1167 to 1222, 1223 (Part), 1225(Part), 1226(Part), 1127(Part), 1228(Part), 1229 to 1242, 1243(Part), 1244(Part), 1245(Part), 1246(Part), 1247(Part), 1248(Part), 1249 to 1266, 1269(Part).
3. **Plot Numbers to be acquired in Kandoha (Part).**
 1(Part),3(Part), 4 to 23, 24/1, 24/2, 25 to 115, 125 to 130, 132(Part), 133, 143 to 148, 155(Part), 156(Part), 157, 158(Part), 159 to 161, 162(Part), 163(Part), 164(Part), 165, 166(Part), 167(Pat), 168(Pat), 169(Part), 177(Part), 178(Part), 391/3(Part), 115/411(Part).

Boundary description.

- A-B Line starts from point 'A' in village Khannath and passes along the Northern boundary of plot numbers 191, 181, 169, 32, 33, 34, through plot numbers 43, 42, northern boundary of plot number 38, through plot number 39, Northern boundary of plot numbers 74, 76, 84, and meets at point 'B'.
- B-B1 Line passes along the Eastern boundary of plot numbers 84, 83, 82, 80 through plot number 115, Eastern boundary of plot number 501, through plot numbers 498, 493, Northern boundary of plot numbers 1139, 1138, 1151, 1152, 1153, 1155, 1156, 1162, 1164 through plot numbers 1164, 1165, 1166, Eastern boundary of plot numbers 1266, 1265, through plot numbers 1269, 1248, 1247, 1246, 1245, 1244, 1243, 1228, 1227, 1226, 1225, 1223 and meets on the common boundary of villages Khannath- Khairha and meets at point 'B1'.
- B1-C Line passes in village Khairha through plot numbers 176, 183, 184, Eastern boundary of villages 182, 187, 192, 196, 201, 200, 199, 203, then enter in village Kandoha and passes through plot number 1, Northern boundary of plot number 4 and passes through plot number 3, then through Baisaha Nalla and meets at point 'C'.
- C-D Line passes through Baisaha Nalla then enter in village Kandoha and passes through plot numbers 391/3, 167, 166, 168, 169, 164, 177, 163, 162, 178, 158, 155, 156, Eastern boundary of plot number 147, 148, Southern boundary of plot numbers 148, 147, 143, 133 and meets at point 'D'.
- D-D1- Line passes as per All Rights Area boundary description and meets at D2-D3 point 'D3'.
- D3-E-F Line passes along the Eastern boundary of plot number 129, Southern boundary of plot number 129, 125, through plot number 411, through nalla and enter in village Khairha passes through plot number 205, Southern boundary of plot numbers 509, 508, 504, 500, 497 through plot number 493, Southern boundary of plot numbers 250, 251, 252, 245, 244, 271, 270, 269, 299, 327, 303, 304, 315, 313, 55 and meets at point 'F'.
- F-A Line passes in village Khairha through plot numbers 55, 53/1 along the Western boundary of plot number 53/2, then through plot numbers 53/1, 52, 51, 2, 4, 5, enter in village Khannath and passes through plot numbers 218, Western boundary of plot number 194, through plot numbers 192, 191, and meets at the starting point 'A'.

नई दिल्ली, 4 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1645.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रतीत होता है, कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है;

इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. डब्ल्यूसीएल/सी-1(ई) III /जे.जे.एन.आर./700-1002, तारीख 3 अक्टूबर, 2002 का निरीक्षण वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व विभाग), कोल एस्टेट, सिविल लाईन्स, नागपुर 440001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में या कलेक्टर, यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काऊंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है;

इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाली भूमि में हितबद्ध सभी व्यक्ति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट सभी नक्शों, चार्टों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 90 दिनों के भीतर भारसाधक अधिकारी/विभागाध्यक्ष (राजस्व) वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, कोल एस्टेट, सिविल लाईन्स, नागपुर-440 001 (महाराष्ट्र) को भेज सकेंगे।

अनुसूची
मंदर खंड
वनी उत्तरी क्षेत्र
जिला यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं. डब्ल्यू सी एल/सी - 1(ई) III /जे.जे.एन.आर./700-1002 तारीख 3 अक्टूबर, 2002)

क्रम संख्या	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्किल संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1	वनी	28	वनी	यवतमाल	240.00	भाग
2	गणेशपुर	27	वनी	यवतमाल	92.00	भाग
3	वागदरा	29	वनी	यवतमाल	188.00	भाग
4	धाबापुर	39	वनी	यवतमाल	95.00	भाग
5	मानकी	38	वनी	यवतमाल	112.00	भाग
6	मंदर	37	वनी	यवतमाल	11.00	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र :- 738.00 हेक्टर (लगभग)

या

1823.60 एकड़ (लगभग)

सीमा वर्णन

- क-ख रेखा 'क' से आरम्भ होती है और ग्राम धाबापुर और गणेशपुर से होती हुई जाती है और बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।
- ख-ग रेखा ग्राम गणेशपुर से होती हुई जाती है फिर ग्राम वनी और वागदरा से होती हुई आगे बढ़ती है और बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।
- ग-घ रेखा ग्राम वागदरा और मंदर से होती हुई जाती है और बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।
- घ-क रेखा ग्राम मंदर से होती हुई जाती है फिर ग्राम मानकी और धाबापुर से होती हुई आगे बढ़ती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. -43015/4/2003-पी.आर.आई. डब्ल्यू.]

संजय बहादुर, उप सचिव

New Delhi, 4th June, 2003

S. O. 1645.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein ;

The plan bearing No. WCL/C-1(E)III/JJNR/700-1002 dated the 3rd October, 2002 of the area covered by this notification can be inspected in the office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Department), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur – 440 001 (Maharashtra) or in the office of the Collector, Yavatmal (Maharashtra) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata ;

All persons interested in the lands covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Officer-in-Charge/Head of the Department (Revenue), Western Coalfields Limited, Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur – 440 001 (Maharashtra) within ninety days from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

**Mandar Block, Wani North Area
District Yavatmal (Maharashtra)**

(Plan No. WCL/C-1(E)III/JJNR/700-1002 dated the 3rd October, 2002).

Serial Number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in Hectares	Remarks
1	Wani	28	Wani	Yavatmal	240.00	Part
2	Ganeshpur	27	Wani	Yavatmal	92.00	Part
3	Wagdara	29	Wani	Yavatmal	188.00	Part
4	Dhabapur	39	Wani	Yavatmal	95.00	Part
5	Manki	38	Wani	Yavatmal	112.00	Part
6	Mandar	37	Wani	Yavatmal	11.00	Part

Total area : 738.00 hectares (approximately)
or 1823.60 acres (approximately)

Boundary description :-

- A – B : Line starts from point 'A' and passes through villages Dhabapur and Ganeshpur and meets at point 'B'.
- B – C : Line passes through village Ganeshpur then proceeds through villages Wani and Wagdara and meets at point 'C'.
- C – D : Line passes through villages Wagdara and Mandar and meets at point 'D'.
- D – A : Line passes through village Mandar then proceeds through villages Manki and Dhabapur and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 43015/4/2003-P.R.I/W.]
SANJAY BAHADUR, Dy. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रीलय

नई दिल्ली, 6 जून, 2003

क. का. आ. 1646.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में सहारनपुर से नजीबाबाद तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको, भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में श्री लोकेन्द्र पाल सिंह, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, सहारनपुर—नजीबाबाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना, के-33, पल्लवपुरम, फेस-2, मेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील: नकुड़

जिला: सहारनपुर

राज्य: उत्तर प्रदेश

गांव	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टेयर	आर	सेटीआर
1	2	3	4	5
पिलखनी	538	0	00	30

तहसील: सहारनपुर

जिला: सहारनपुर

राज्य: उत्तर प्रदेश

गांव	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टेयर	आर	सेटीआर
1	2	3	4	5
दाबकी गूजर	470	0	01	50
हौजखेड़ी	79	0	02	10
	94	0	08	38
दराकोट्टला	617	0	03	19
चाटका	20	0	00	30
	35	0	03	90
गागल हेड़ी अहतमाल	94	0	00	20
	95	0	03	18
	96	0	00	33
	97	0	06	52
	10	0	07	60
	101	0	03	35
	104	0	03	68
	105	0	00	40
	106	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5
	107	0	01	92
	178	0	02	04
	179	0	00	42
	180	0	68	88
गाँधी नगर का पाल हेड़ी पुरतहकमा	239	0	01	20
चौरादेव	90	0	01	72
	634	0	00	80
	694	0	01	33

[फा. सं. आर-25011/7/2003-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas

New Delhi, 6th June, 2003

S. O. 1646.— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of Petroleum products from Saharanpur to Najibabad in the State of Uttar Pradesh, a Pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of user in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri Lokendra Pal Singh, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Saharanpur - Najibabad Pipeline Project, K-33, Pallavpuram, Phase-II, Meerut (U.P.)

SCHEDULE

Teshil : Nakur

District : Saharanpur

State : Uttar Pradesh

Village	Khasra No.	Area		
		Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
Pilkhani	538	0	00	30

Teshil : Saharanpur

District : Saharanpur

State : Uttar Pradesh

Village	Khasra No.	Area		
		Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
Dabki Gujar	470	0	01	50
Hauz Kheri	79	0	02	10
	94	0	08	38
Dara Kottala	617	0	03	19
Chatka	20	0	00	30
	35	0	03	90
Gagalheri Ahtmal	94	0	00	20
	95	0	03	18
	96	0	00	33
	97	0	06	52
	100	0	07	60
	101	0	03	35
	104	0	03	58
	105	0	00	40
	106	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5
	107	0	01	92
	178	0	02	04
	179	0	00	42
	180	0	08	88
Gagalheri Mustahkam	239	0	01	20
Chaura Dev	90	0	01	72
	634	0	00	80
	694	0	01	33

[No. R-25011/7/2003-O.R.-I]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1647.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड की संवर्धक कम्पनी मेसर्स रिलाएंस इण्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के गोवा में उत्तरी/दक्षिण खोज ब्लाकों और आन्ध्र प्रदेश में संरचनाओं से गोवा राज्य में उत्तर / दक्षिण गोवा जिलों के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइनें बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से सलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इककीस दिन के भीतर, श्री गोविन्द पी. देसाई, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड, पाइपलाइन परियोजना, चतुर्थ तल, डेंपो ट्रेड सेंटर, पाटो काम्पलेक्स, पणजी—गोवा 403001 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची 3(1)						
तालुका - फोडा		ज़िल्हा : उत्तर गोवा		राज्य : गोवा		
क्र. नं.	गांव का नाम	स्वेच्छा नंबर	सबडिविजन नं.	हेक्टर	ऐरे	स्केमी.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	कुण्डई	201	23	0	00	48
				0	00	48
2	भोमा	48	2	0	05	23
		48	3	0	03	30
				0	08	53
3	अडकोण	73	38	0	05	10
		14	21	0	01	47
				0	06	57
4	खाडोडा	116	4	0	00	12
		1110		0	10	50
		123	30	0	11	70
		123	29	0	09	90
				0	32	22

[फा. सं. एल.-14014/51/02-जी.पी.]

स्वामी सिंह, निदेशक

New Delhi, 9th June, 2003

S. O. 1647.— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of natural gas from exploration blocks in the Northern/Southern Offshore of Goa and structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to various consumers of North and South Goa Districts in the State of Goa, pipelines should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And, whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipelines are proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub- section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to Shri Govind P. Dessai, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited, Pipeline Project, 4th Floor, Dempo Trade Centre, Patto Complex, Panaji-Goa 403001.

SCHEDULE - 3(1)						
Taluka - Ponda		District - North Goa		State - Goa		
Sl. No.	Village Name	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Cundalm	201	23	0	00	48
				0	00	48
2	Bhoma	48	2	0	05	23
		48	3	0	03	30
				0	08	53
3	Adcolna	73	38	0	05	10
		14	21	0	01	47
				0	06	57
4	Candola	116	4	0	00	12
		111		0	10	50
		123	30	0	11	70
		123	29	0	09	90
				0	32	22

[No. L-14014/51/02-G.P.]
SWAMY SINGH, Director

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1648.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में जामनगर से मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में भोपाल तक पुनः गैसीकृत द्रवित प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा जामनगर-भोपाल पाइपलाइन परियोजना के क्रियान्वयन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियां सांघारण, जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में श्री एन. एस. कनेश, सक्षम प्राधिकारी जी. टी. आई. सी. एल. पाइपलाइन परियोजना, भू-तल, 24ए, चन्द्रनगर, ए० बी० रोड़ इन्दौर-452008 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : सावेर

जिला : इंदौर

राज्य : मध्यप्रदेश

गांव का नाम

सर्वे नंबर

क्षेत्रफल

हेक्टेयर

आरे

सेन्टीयर

1	2	3	4	5
1. लसूडिया परमार	57	0	96	95
	58	0	38	70
	326	0	10	65
	334	0	11	90
	327	0	57	00
	329	0	01	80
	330	0	21	30
	332	0	18	15
	367	0	21	25
	368	0	12	95
	369	0	01	60
	371	0	26	35
	372	0	07	70
	385	0	00	70
	384	0	84	65
	383	0	10	20
	375	0	03	05

[फा. सं. एल.-14014/27/2001-जी.पी.]

स्वामी सिंह, निदेशक

New Delhi, 9th June, 2003

S. O. 1648.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the regassified liquefied natural gas from Jamnagar in the State of Gujarat to Bhopal in the State of Madhya Pradesh a pipeline should be laid by Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited for implementing Jamnagar-Bhopal pipeline Project;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user(ROU) in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub- section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri N.S.Kanesh, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited Pipeline Project, Ground floor, 24- A Chandra Nagar A,B,Road, Indore -452008.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Sanwer

District : Indore

State: Madhya Pradesh

Name of the Village	Survey No.	AREA		
		Hectare	Are	C-Are
1	2	3	4	5
1.LASUDIYA PARMAR	57	0	96	95
	58	0	38	70
	326	0	10	65
	334	0	11	90
	327	0	57	00
	329	0	01	80
	330	0	21	30
	332	0	18	15
	367	0	21	25
	368	0	12	95
	369	0	01	60
	371	0	26	35
	372	0	07	70
	385	0	00	70
	384	0	84	65
	383	0	10	20
	375	0	03	05

[No. L-14014/27/2001-G.P.]
SWAMY SINGH, Director

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1649.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड की संप्रवर्तक कम्पनी मैसर्स रिलाएंस इन्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के गोवा के उत्तरी/दक्षिणी अपतट खेज ब्लाकों और कर्नाटक में संरचनाओं से कर्नाटक राज्य में बीदर ज़िले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एण्ड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा (3) की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, श्री एम. लक्ष्मीनारायण, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जी.टी.आई.सी.एल. उपायुक्त गुलबर्गा विकास भवन, गुलबर्गा, कर्नाटक राज्य पिन-585 101 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

2

अनुसूची 3 (1)

तालुक वसवकल्याण	गांव का नाम	सर्व नं	हिस्सा नं	गट नं	राज्य कर्नाटक		
					क्षेत्र	आर	सेटीशार
अ. क्र.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	यकरती	39	11		0	13	00
		39	12		0	01	20
		39	13		0	00	70
		40	4		0	04	00
		40	6		0	15	20
		40	8		0	07	80
	कुल				0	41	90
2	मैसलगा	77	4		0	04	30
		105			0	06	50
	कुल				0	10	80
तालुक हुमनाबाद							
तालुक	गांव का नाम	सर्व नं	हिस्सा नं	गट नं	राज्य कर्नाटक		
					क्षेत्र	आर	सेटीशार
अ. क्र.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	उडबाळ	127			1	58	90
	कुल				1	58	90

तालुका इमानावाद	गांव का नाम	सर्वे नं	जिला गैदर	हिस्सा नं	गट नं	राज्य कार्टिक		
						हेक्टर	आर	सेटीएसर
अ. क.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	निर्णा	531				0	22	90
		477				0	52	50
		478				0	21	90
		474				0	15	00
		475				0	02	30
		473	A			0	16	80
		कुल				1	31	40

[फा. सं. एल.-14014/33/2002-जी.पी.]

स्वामी सिंह, निदेशक

New Delhi, 9th June, 2003

S. O. 1649.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from the exploration blocks in the Northern/Southern Offshore of Goa and structure in Karnataka of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to the various consumers of District Bidar in the State of Karnataka, pipelines should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user(ROU) in land under which the said pipelines are proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub- section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to Shri M.Lakshminarayana, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited, Deputy Commissioner Gulbarga Vikas Bhavan, Gulbarga, Karnataka State Pin 585 101

SCHEDULE - 3(1)

Taluka - Basavakalyan District : Bidar State : Karnataka

Sl. No.	Village	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area		
					Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Yelwanthi	39	11		0	13	00
		39	12		0	01	20
		39	13		0	00	70
		40	4		0	04	00
		40	6		0	15	20
		40	8		0	07	80
Total : -					0	41	90

2	Maisalga	77	4	0	04	30
		105		0	06	50
	Total :-			0	10	80

Taluka - Humnabad			District : Bidar			State : Karnataka		
Sl. No.	Village	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.		Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
3	Udbal	127			1	58	90	
	Total:-				1	58	90	

Taluka - Humnabad			District : Bidar			State : Karnataka		
Sl. No.	Village	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.		Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
4	Nirna	531			0	22	90	
		477			0	52	50	
		478			0	21	90	
		474			0	15	00	
		475			0	02	30	
		473	A		0	16	80	
	Total :-				1	31	40	

[No. L-14014/33/2002-G.P.]
SWAMY SINGH, Director

नई दिल्ली, 9 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1650.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड की संवर्धक कम्पनी मेसर्स रिलाएंस इण्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के गोवा के उत्तरी/दक्षिणी अपतट के खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य की संरचनाओं से आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य के पश्चिमी गोदावरी और कृष्णा जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाद्धत अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिससे उक्त अधिनियम की धारा (3) की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इककीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के लिए श्री पी.वी.रमणा, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जी.टी.आई.सी.एल. पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 3-20-7/1, राम मोहन राजा नगर, काकीनाडा 533003, ईस्ट गोदावरी जिला, आन्ध्रप्रदेश राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

अनुसूची

मंडल :	आगिरिपल्लि	जिल्हा :	किञ्चा	राज्य :		
				गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सं। सब डिविजन सं.	आन्ध्र प्रदेश
1	2	हेक्टर	एर	एरिया	सि एर	
1) बोडडनपल्लि	169 / 2 ए, 169 / 2 वी	00	12	36		
	183/5	00	10	48		
	279	00	38	27		
	265	00	26	67		
	270/3	00	25	68		
	266/3	00	00	10		
	266/1	00	53	32		
	286/3	00	06	68		
	165 / 1 वी	00	00	46		
	289	00	33	78		
	179 / 1 ए, 1,179 / 1 ए, 2,179 / 1 ए 3,179 / 1 वी, 179 / 1 वी 1	00	42	21		
	181 / 2 ए, 181 / 2 वी	00	00	10		
	270/2	00	07	44		
	181/7	00	18	23		
	92/1	00	23	34		
	491/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	89		
	164 / 1 ए, 164 / 1 वी, 164 / 1 शी	00	31	71		
	सर्वे नंवर 287 और सर्वे नंवर 289 के वीच में (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	10		
	490 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	38		
	95 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	29		
	184 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	16		
	498/1,498/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	92		
	193 / 1 ए, 193 / 1 वी (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	32	34		
	94 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	43		
	285	00	74	28		
	287 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	30		
	183/4	00	00	28		
	196 / 1 वी (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	14	63		
	267 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	26		
	169/3 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	13	24		
	165/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	35		
	81 / 1 ई	00	19	62		
	270/1	00	16	07		
	164/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	95		
	181/8	00	11	77		
	181 / 3 ए, 1,181 / 3 वी, 1,181 / 3 वी 3	00	10	47		

1	2	3	4	5
1) योडडनपल्लि (निरंतर)	195 / 1 सी	00	08	21
	196 / 3 ए, 196 / 3 बी	00	00	10
	195 / 2 बी	00	21	56
	195 / 4 ए	00	05	68
	195 / 1 ए	00	02	21
	93/1	00	33	22
	96/2	00	31	02
	196/2	00	05	26
	93/2	00	50	40
	64	00	41	74
	63	00	10	31
	65/2	00	19	88
	491/2	00	14	07
	96/3	00	10	71
	182/1	00	25	65
	78	00	00	20
	193/3	00	02	59
	193/2	00	28	33
	194 / 4 सी	00	12	06
	194 / 5 बी	00	15	89
	196/1	00	06	24
	182/2	00	14	01
	181 / 6 ए, 181 / 6 बी	00	03	98
	180/1, 180/2, 180/3, 180/4, 180/5 , 180/6, 180/7, 180/8	00	48	82
	489	02	29	26
	79 / 2 ए, 79 / 2 बी	00	36	83
	92/2	00	00	27
	81 / 1 ए	00	04	06
	81 / 1 बी	00	20	51
	81 / 1 सी	00	25	11
	81 / 1 झी	00	20	78
	93/3	00	38	87
	170	00	32	44
	288/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	12
	62 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	10	24
2) एडाग	343	00	02	49
	962	00	78	40
	955	00	02	46
	952/2	00	36	30
	957/2	00	61	61
	345 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	07
	352	00	00	54
	351/18	00	07	17

1	2	3	4	5
5) वटिगुडिपाडु (निरंतर)	24 / 1 ए	00	06	79
	46 / 2	00	04	06
	154 / 3	00	10	72
	47 / 8 सी	00	22	77
	47 / 8 वी	00	12	50
	46/1	00	01	81
	46/4	00	13	75
	324 / 6	00	07	91
	60 / 3	00	10	63
	129	00	45	05
	39 / 5 एफ	00	10	82
	324 / 5	00	08	85
	325 / 2	00	01	14
	324 / 7	00	08	36
	324 / 8	00	00	27
	325/ 4	00	14	39
	61 / 3	00	15	07
	321 / 4	00	01	15
	47 / 3	00	00	16
	58	00	04	74
	61/4	00	07	53
	154 / 2 वी	00	01	87
	61/2	00	10	83
	61/1	00	07	48
	61 / 7	00	00	97
	38/6	00	18	79
	322 / 2	00	12	48
	40/ 2 ए	00	00	10
	16 1 / 2	00	04	40
	154 / 2 ए	00	00	18
	40/1	00	08	57
	36 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	03
	145/1	00	00	84
	38 / 10	00	09	16
	145 / 2 सी	00	10	72
	144 / 1 ए	00	04	50
	325 / 3	00	38	13
	146 / 4 सी	00	04	33
	145 / 2 वी	00	12	31
	39 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	16
	145 / 2	00	22	97
	321 / 6 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	14	62
	38 / 8 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	03	84

1	2	3	4	5
5) वटिगुडिपाड़ु (निरंतर)	25 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	11	74
	21 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	39	75
	147 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	20	56
	151 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	06	03
	150 / 1 झी	00	04	62
	322 / 3	00	01	16
	4 6 / 3	00	10	65
	145 / 2 ए	00	08	98
	324 / 3	00	03	19
	324 / 4	00	10	99
	146 / 3	00	04	54
	61/5	00	03	27
	322 / 1	00	18	99
	154/6	00	19	51
	150 / 1 बी	00	08	06
	15 0/ 1 भी	00	15	18
	24/ 1 बी	00	31	56
	146/1	00	01	52
	19 / 15	00	15	27

मंडलः बापुलपाड़ु	जिल्हा : किष्णा	राज्य : आन्ध्रा प्रदेश		
1) विल्लानापल्लि	1 ए 2 / 1	00	48	72
	9/1	00	00	37
	4	00	19	36
	3	00	16	64
	8	00	85	47
	10/1	00	00	70
	9 / 2 बी	00	33	81
	5	00	24	19
	10 / 2 ए	00	02	32
	9/ 2 ए	00	34	63
2) मेडिचेरला	29 / 1 भी	00	22	52
	9/2	00	33	56
	10/1	00	23	11
	146/1	00	30	19
	22 / 2	00	46	04
	1 (फारेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	05	26	65
	10 6 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	03	81
	341/4 (फारेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	28	88
	107	00	55	81
	143	00	96	07
	27/2	00	39	76
	9/1	00	25	04
	29 / 1 झी	00	05	22

1	2	3	4	5
2) मेडिचेला (निरंतर)	358	00	17	91
	29 / 1 वी	00	19	78
	29 / 1 ए	00	01	41
	29 / 2	00	23	21
	28 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	31
	131/5 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	02	94
	128/5	00	26	71
	131 / 2	00	03	20
	131 / 4 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	03	20
	144	00	38	62
	27/1	00	08	37
	11 / 1 वी	00	18	40
	12 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	23
	23 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	54
	8	00	00	10
	115	00	24	49
	114	00	51	42
	131 / 3	00	27	64
	132 / 1	00	53	61
	341/2	00	08	61
	16 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	28
	132 / 3	00	54	76
	11/2	00	26	97
	11 / 1 ए	00	00	53
	21 / 1	00	01	17
	22 / 1	00	15	17
	10/2	00	01	17

मंडलः एलूर	जिल्हा : पश्चिमगोदावरि	राज्य : आन्ध्रा प्रदेश		
1) चोडिमेल्ला	39 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	14	00
	42 / 3	00	05	84
	38/ 1	00	03	77
	105 / 1	00	28	81
	127 /	00	69	26
	1,127/2, 127/3, 127/4, 127 / 5 ए, 127 / 5 वी, 127/6			
	50/ 3	00	04	55
	37 / 3	00	03	04
	38 / 2	00	01	84
	51 / 1	00	14	77
	37 / 4	00	43	66
	128 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	84
	51/ 2	00	42	39
	49 / 1	00	23	36

1	2	3	4	5
1) चौड़िमेला (निरंतर)	109 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	10
	105 / 3	00	37	41
	46	00	02	98
	48	00	17	81
	115	00	10	89
	41 / 8	00	05	93
	106 / 3	00	19	80
	42 / 4	00	04	12
	42 / 5	00	04	55
	42 / 10	00	06	99
	40 / 8	00	00	10
	36 / 2	00	21	76
	105 / 2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	14
	45 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	16	93
	107 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	11	34
	43 / 4	00	20	35
	47 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	37	25
	106 / 4	00	00	10
	108 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	15	30
	114 / 2	00	00	47
	114 / 1	00	05	76
	106 / 2	00	00	22
	84	00	00	90
	53 / 1	00	00	10
	41 / 7	00	03	05

मंडल व नूजिविड़ु	जिल्हा व किञ्चा	राज्य व आन्ध्र प्रदेश		
1) मोरसापुडि	185 / 5	00	04	39
	181 / 1	00	04	90
	241 / 1	00	22	90
	181 / 3	00	11	79
	181 / 4	00	00	10
	167 / 1 वी, 167 / 2	00	32	85
	241 / 2	00	03	65
	206 / 4	00	30	14
	211 / 1	00	11	44
	181 / 6	00	48	70
	242 / 2 ए	00	23	51
	218 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	81
	291 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	00
	210 / 2	00	25	07
	181 / 7	00	01	49
	296 / 2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	14	47
	294	00	00	15

1	2	3	4	5
1) मोरसापुडि (निरंतर)	300 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	60
	182 / 2	00	74	03
	186 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	44
	169 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	72
	183	00	27	59
	292 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	36
	210 / 3	00	28	70
	206 / 5	00	01	04
	290/1	00	16	24
	290/2	00	19	10
	210 / 4	00	01	92
	209 / 4	00	10	66
	209 / 3	00	18	63
	209 / 2	00	24	57
	295 / 3 वी	00	11	73
	242 / 2 वी	00	19	19
	299 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	10	56
	181 / 2	00	08	82
	210 / 1	00	23	83
	296 / 1 वी	00	06	61
2) पोलशानपल्लि	32 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	03	78
	25/7	00	03	80
	33/6	00	23	91
	25/6	00	14	80
	13/ 1	00	61	05
	ए, 13/1 ए, 13/1 ए, 13/1 ए, 13 / 1 वी, 13/2, 13/3, 13/4 ए, 13 / 4 वी, 13 / 5 वी, 13 / 6 वी, 13 / 7 वी, 13 / 8 वी, 13 / 9 वी, 13 / 10 वी, 13/11, 13 / 12 वी			
	17/11	00	10	43
	25/8	00	00	10
	15/2	00	08	31
	15 / 3	00	07	72
	26/12	00	42	72
	17/9	00	00	96
	25/9	00	19	79
	16/6	00	13	48
	19/1	00	00	10
	33/5	00	03	91
	21 / 3	00	13	81
	21 / 4 ए	00	11	78
	25/10	00	05	30
	16/8	00	09	98

1	2	3	4	5
2) पोलसानपलि (निरंतर)	19/2	00	15	87
	17/10	00	15	99
	21/6 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	03	14
	15/1	00	04	61
	21 / 4 श्री	00	15	62
	20 / 5	00	00	10
	20 / 4	00	07	75
	21 / 5	00	22	24
	21/1	00	00	93
	21/ 2	00	09	35
	16/7	00	19	80
	20/2	00	03	44
	25/1	00	03	81
	16/5	00	01	42
3) राविचोरला	10 6	00	37	92
	211 / 3	00	07	67
	71 / 4	00	40	38
	151	00	25	57
	73	00	36	47
	57 / 3	00	00	63
	57 / 2	00	06	25
	107 / 1, 107/2	00	02	02
	229/ 4	00	02	34
	104	00	60	65
	103	00	48	47
	88	00	00	24
	71 / 2	00	01	70
	87	00	04	20
	92	00	75	84
	142	00	00	75
	108 / 2	00	09	67
	231 / 1	00	04	12
	223	00	03	96
	224 / 2 ए, 224 / 2 श्री	00	63	95
	229 / 5	00	02	56
	86	00	97	42
	228 / 6	00	50	06
	60 / 1	00	04	52
	70 / 3	00	08	34
	70 / 6	00	02	31
	70 / 5	00	20	11
	70 / 4	00	25	39
	59 / 1	00	11	57

1	2	3	4	5
3) रविचोरला (निरंतर)	69 / 3	00	02	39
	253 / 1	00	11	79
	152 / 1	00	31	07
	211 / 6	00	01	97
	149 / 1	00	72	54
	150 / 1	00	28	18
	61	00	29	99
	108 / 3	00	40	48
	152 / 2	00	01	84
	62 / 6	00	17	13
	93	00	00	99
	58/1,58/2,58/3,58/4,58/5,58/6 ,58/7,58/8,58/9,58/10,58/11	00	37	21
	57 / 4	00	00	98
	55 / 7	00	04	59
	55 / 6	00	02	12
	49/ 4	00	01	48
	49 / 7	00	02	50
	49 / 5	00	13	65
	62 / 7	00	22	29
	57 / 1	00	15	61
	268 / 1 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	00	49
	54 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	24
	90 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	80
	150 / 2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	78
	229 / 7	00	13	08
	229 / 6	00	15	10
	63 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	93
	253 / 4 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	00	60
	253 / 3	00	19	87
	सबे नंवर 61 और सबे नंवर 63 के बीच मे (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	15	30
	136 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	45
	82 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	15	51
	224 / 3 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	00	10
	56 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	19
	72 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	14	99
	132 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	24	73
	253 / 2	00	11	34
	71 / 3 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	16
	49 / 6 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	48
	211 / 1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	38

1	2	3	4	5
3) राविचोरला (निरंतर)	212/1, 212/2, 212/3, 212/4, 21 2/5, 212/6, 212/7, 212/8, 212/ 9, 212/10, 212/11, 212/12, 21 2/13, 212/14, 212/15, 212/16, 212/17	00	14	00
268 / 2	00	35	00	
269	00	28	00	
251 / 2	00	15	93	
264 / 7	00	21	77	
264 / 8	00	10	74	
264 / 5	00	15	91	
264 / 3	00	13	53	
264 / 4	00	13	76	
83 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	80	
211 / 2	00	00	10	
229 / 2	00	00	10	
210 / 2	00	06	26	
210 / 1	00	07	95	
210 / 7	00	04	41	
210 / 8	00	10	15	
216 / 2	00	12	87	
211 / 4	00	13	35	
246 / 3	00	27	86	
210 / 3	00	04	17	
91 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	53	
247 / 2	00	17	39	
251 / 3	00	12	05	
251 / 1	00	22	76	
247 / 3	00	29	23	
210 / 9	00	00	87	
231 / 2	00	10	79	
210 / 4	00	00	10	
211 / 5	00	11	29	
235 / 1	00	22	51	
230 / 1	00	15	34	
247 / 1	00	12	17	
230 / 2	00	01	84	
216 / 1	00	78	57	
231 / 3	00	13	50	
232/1, 232/2, 232/3, 232/4, 23 2/5, 232/6	00	01	84	
231 / 4	00	45	74	
231 / 5	00	20	40	
246 / 1	00	23	17	

1	2	3	4	5
4) वोंपाडु (निरंतर)	220	00	26	57
	111/2	00	32	38
	222/1	00	06	15
	178	01	19	09
	53/2	00	06	68
	52/3	00	00	10
	177	00	31	34
	179	00	46	14
	110	00	46	96
	24/4	00	07	97
	30/2	00	04	83
	221	00	39	71
	82/3	00	18	97
	22/2	00	04	36
	29	00	29	47
	32	00	01	10
	20/2	00	01	95
	30/1	00	03	05
	84/3	00	23	35
	50/2	00	18	09
	82/2	00	08	85
	82/4	00	08	66
	84/4	00	14	71
	112	00	06	20
	264	00	54	10
	263	00	47	05
	108	00	07	74
	262	00	00	55
	30/3	00	36	08
	111/1	00	41	88
	50/1	00	25	50
	80 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	31
	33/2	00	04	56
	22/1	00	13	66
	82/1	00	05	34
	61/1	00	30	99
	84/2	00	09	42
	23 (गवर्नमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	14	68
	180	00	50	86
	44 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	08
	187	00	66	71
सबे नंबर 111 और सबे नंबर 112 के बीच में (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)		00	05	36

1	2	3	4	5
4) वोंपाडु (निरंतर)	सबे नंबर 162 और सबे नंबर 163 के बीच मे (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	40
	186 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	55
	163 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	82
	52/1	00	22	01
	53/1	00	18	32
	52/2	00	20	86
	22/3	00	05	66
	33/1	00	24	90
	161	00	01	03
	162	01	37	56
	189	00	00	69
	190	00	64	77
	196	00	17	94
	84/6	00	00	35
	83	00	49	23
	24/2	00	28	14
	84/7	00	23	16
	84/5	00	16	18
	20/3	00	64	40
	21/1	00	14	58
	21/2	00	00	84
	22/4	00	22	26
	188	00	49	40

मंडलः पेदवेगि	जिल्हा : पश्चिमगोदावरि	राज्य : आन्ध्रा प्रदेश		
1) जगन्नादपुरमु	359 / 1	00	13	89
	367	00	00	10
	364	00	11	04
	356	00	37	66
	355	00	14	01
	359 / 2 श्री	00	00	57
	359 / 2 ए	00	22	75
	366 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	10	32
	358 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	26	36
	365 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	41
2) कोप्पाका	120/1	00	02	89
	154/4	00	20	56
	118	00	25	66
	160 / 8	00	00	18
	153	00	05	24
	15 9 /2	00	00	10
	987 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	53
	225 / 2	00	01	98

1	2	3	4	5
2) कोप्पाका (निरंतर)	225 / 1	00	25	90
	226 / 6	00	02	18
	226 / 8	00	21	96
	983 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	29
	159 / 3	00	18	30
	157 / 1	00	11	23
	120/6	00	22	90
	989 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	39
	1009 / 2 वी	00	48	78
	196 / 3	00	11	28
	120/5	00	14	86
	120/4	00	15	78
	120/3	00	12	55
	197 / 4	00	12	05
	158	00	04	24
	205 / 2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	82
	192 / 2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	10
	120/7	00	03	54
	116/2	00	01	34
	203 / 5	00	01	56
	205 / 1	00	22	89
	197 / 3	00	04	12
	193	00	08	34
	218 / 7	00	04	85
	1010/1	00	32	43
	154/5	00	04	37
	785/1	00	25	90
	203 / 3	00	21	60
	788/1	00	03	11
	788/4	00	15	48
	788/3	00	26	42
	1008/2	00	00	10
	205 / 3	00	26	82
	1009 / 2 ए	00	07	93
	117	00	36	48
	191 / 6	00	24	90
	194/ 4	00	01	64
	977	00	44	56
	194 / 1	00	00	15
	998	00	41	58
	1010/3	00	00	10
	195 / 2	00	38	43
	1010/2	00	14	84

1	2	3	4	5
2) कोषाका (निरंतर)	191 / 5	00	00	10
	203 / 4	00	17	62
	191 / 7	00	10	76
	192 / 1	00	00	16
	189	00	04	71
	195 / 1	00	17	19
	202 / 1	00	08	70
	203 / 2	00	03	61
	120/2	00	08	59
	210 / 5	00	16	75
	156/2	00	14	48
	956/3	00	12	71
	1073/2 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	02	02
	1050/4 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	01	54
	1072 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	00	10
	1071/1 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	46	63
	157 / 2	00	09	00
	156/3	00	07	11
	218 / 4	00	00	73
	152	00	00	10
	154/2	00	14	41
	154/1	00	10	87
	788/2	00	17	50
	156/1	00	10	29
	157/4	00	00	10
	956 / 5 ए, 956 / 5 बी, 956 / 5 सी	00	00	28
	1061/4 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	33	19
	1009/1 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	10	22
	1008/1 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	05	69
	1063 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	39	77
	215 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	04	68
	228 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	10	49
	1071/2 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	05	63
	1066 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	83	92
	956/4	00	24	81
	1061/3 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	03	37
	1050/3 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	17	30
	1050/2 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	28	43
	1073/1 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	51	38
	1049 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	47	61
	1051/4 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	16	85
	1062 (फोरेस्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	39	68
	197 / 6	00	10	10

1	2	3	4	5
3) पिनकडिमि (निरंतर)	36 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	78
	28 / 4	00	06	07
	28 / 5	00	17	89
	21 / 1	00	06	11
	31 / 1	00	39	31
	20 / 6	00	02	58
	55 / 1 वी	00	01	59
	20 / 2	00	12	99
	47 / 2 ए, 47 / 2 वी	00	00	18
4) चंगू	161 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	46
	103/ 2	00	03	09
	192 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	11	49
	104 / 1	00	19	28
	91 / 5 वी (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	40
	160 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	37
	91 / 5 सी	00	03	46
	88 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	16
	186	00	11	26
	91 / 5 ए	00	11	65
	181 / 2	00	13	85
	159 / 2	00	31	51
	174/1, 174/2, 174/3, 174/4, 174/ 5, 174/6	00	09	70
	175/ 2	00	09	79
	176 / 2 वी	00	17	16
	176 / 2 ए	00	14	82
	95	00	17	57
	182	00	17	68
	203/1	00	02	26
	189	00	20	34
	159 / 1	00	10	57
	39/ 6	00	03	93
	39 / 5	00	11	52
	39 / 4	00	11	62
	183	00	27	54
	170 / 2	00	06	15
	191 / 3	00	11	78
	92 / 2	00	19	36
	92 / 4 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	34
	93	00	08	85
	87 / 2 ए, 87 / 2 वी	00	00	18
	94/1	00	22	24
	170 / 3	00	23	70
	87/1	00	38	42

1	2	3	4	5
4) वांगू (निरंतर)	190/2 181 / 3 191/2 203/2 203/ 3 171 / 2 39 / 3 92 / 3 190 / 3	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	27 06 07 15 00 45 11 06 22	98 00 85 71 38 38 56 92 00

[फा. सं. एल.-14014/15/2003-जी.पी.]
स्वामी सिंह, निदेशक

New Delhi, 9th June, 2003

S. O. 1650.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from the exploration blocks in the Northern/Southern Offshore of Goa and structure in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to the various consumers of West Godavari and Krishna Districts in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub- section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land)Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri P.V Ramana, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited Pipeline Project, 3-20-7/1, Vana Mohana Raja Nagar, Kakinada 533003, East Godavari Dist. Andhra Pradesh State.

Schedule

Mandal : Agiripalli District : Krishna State : Andhra Pradesh

Village	Survey No./Sub-Division No.	Area of ROU		
		Hectare	Are	C-Are
1	2	3	4	5
1) Boddanapalli	169/2A,169/2B	00	12	36
	183/5	00	10	48
	279	00	38	27
	265	00	26	67
	270/3	00	25	68
	266/3	00	00	10
	266/1	00	53	32
	286/3	00	06	68
	165/1B	00	00	46
	289	00	33	78
	179/1A1,179/1A2,179/1A3,179/1B ,179/1B1	00	42	21
	181/2A,181/2B	00	00	10
	270/2	00	07	44
	181/7	00	18	23
	92/1	00	23	34
	491/1 (Crossing Land)	00	00	89
	164/1A,164/1B,164/1C	00	31	71
	Between Survey number 287 and Survey number 289 (Crossing Land)	00	08	10
	490 (Crossing Land)	00	09	38
	95 (Crossing Land)	00	09	29
	184 (Crossing Land)	00	08	16
	498/1,498/2 (Crossing Land)	00	01	92
	193/1A.,193/1B (Crossing Land)	00	32	34
	94 (Crossing Land)	00	01	43
	285	00	74	28
	287 (Crossing Land)	00	08	30
	183/4	00	00	28
	195/1B (Crossing Land)	00	14	63
	267 (Crossing Land)	00	04	26
	169/3 (Crossing Land)	00	13	24
	165/2 (Crossing Land)	00	08	35
	81/1E	00	19	62
	270/1	00	16	07
	164/2 (Crossing Land)	00	06	95
	181/8	00	11	77
	181/3A1,181/3B1,181/3B3	00	10	47

1	2	3	4	5
1) Boddanapalli (Contd...)	195/1C	00	08	21
	196/3A,196/3B	00	00	10
	195/2B	00	21	56
	195/4A	00	05	68
	195/1A	00	02	21
	93/1	00	33	22
	96/2	00	31	02
	196/2	00	05	26
	93/2	00	50	40
	64	00	41	74
	63	00	10	31
	65/2	00	19	88
	491/2	00	14	07
	96/3	00	10	71
	182/1	00	25	65
	78	00	00	20
	193/3	00	02	59
	193/2	00	28	33
	194/4C	00	12	06
	194/5B	00	15	89
	196/1	00	06	24
	182/2	00	14	01
	181/6A,181/6B	00	03	98
	180/1,180/2,180/3,180/4,180/5,180/ 6,180/7,180/8	00	48	82
	489	02	29	26
	79/2A,79/2B	00	36	83
	92/2	00	00	27
	81/1A	00	04	06
	81/1B	00	20	51
	81/1C	00	25	11
	81/1D	00	20	78
	93/3	00	38	87
	170	00	32	44
	288/1 (Crossing Land)	00	04	12
	62 (Crossing Land)	00	10	24
2) Edara	345	00	02	49
	962	00	78	40
	955	00	02	46
	952/2	00	36	30
	957/2	00	61	61
	345 (Crossing Land)	00	06	07
	352	00	00	54
	351/18	00	07	17

1	2	3	4	5
2) Edara (Contd....)				
	351/16	00	03	38
	351/19	00	07	28
	351/20	00	02	28
	965/1	00	05	09
	351/12	00	00	10
	967/1	00	01	50
	344 (Crossing Land)	00	22	95
	369/15	00	02	05
	954 (Crossing Land)	00	14	80
	953 (Crossing Land)	00	04	28
	963 (Crossing Land)	00	15	21
	964 (Crossing Land)	00	05	95
	349	00	43	86
	351/15	00	10	86
	350/8	00	00	10
	931	00	07	55
	342 (Crossing Land)	00	00	40
	932/1 (Crossing Land)	00	22	02
	947/3B (Crossing Land)	00	21	67
	958/1B (Crossing Land)	00	04	80
	369/14	00	00	38
	930	00	19	62
	926	00	22	79
	933	00	36	03
	947/3A	00	10	89
	958/1A	00	22	21
	369/19	00	01	77
	348/1	00	66	32
	351/17	00	11	50
	366/14	00	05	33
	369/18	00	00	10
	977 (Government Land)	05	35	92
3) Malliboyinapalli(INAM)	2	00	22	42
4) Vadlamantu	71/1B	00	05	61
	71/1A	00	15	20
	71/3	00	02	07
5) Vattigudipadu	47/9	00	00	27
	161/1	00	61	30
	154/4	00	23	66
	154/5	00	15	36
	324/2	00	00	10
	47/8D	00	07	99
	60/2	00	16	80

1	2	3	4	5
5) Vattigudipadu (Contd .)	24/1A	00	06	79
	46/2	00	04	06
	154/3	00	10	72
	47/8C	00	22	77
	47/8B	00	12	50
	46/1	00	01	81
	46/4	00	13	75
	324/6	00	07	91
	60/3	00	10	63
	129	00	45	05
	38/5F	00	10	82
	324/5	00	08	85
	325/2	00	01	14
	324/7	00	08	36
	324/8	00	00	27
	325/4	00	14	39
	61/3	00	15	07
	321/4	00	01	15
	47/3	00	00	16
	58	00	04	74
	61/4	00	07	53
	154/2B	00	01	87
	61/2	00	10	83
	61/1	00	07	48
	61/7	00	00	97
	38/6	00	18	79
	322/2	00	12	48
	40/2A	00	00	10
	161/2	00	04	40
	154/2A	00	00	18
	40/1	00	08	57
	36 (Crossing Land)	00	05	03
	145/1	00	00	84
	38/10	00	09	16
	145/2C	00	10	72
	144/1A	00	04	50
	325/3	00	38	13
	146/4C	00	04	33
	145/2B	00	12	31
	39 (Crossing Land)	00	05	16
	145/2	00	22	97
	321/6 (Government Land)	00	14	62
	38/8 (Government Land)	00	03	84

1	2	3	4	5
5) Vattigudipadu (Contd....)	25 (Government Land)	00	11	74
	21 (Government Land)	00	39	75
	147 (Government Land)	00	20	56
	151 (Government Land)	00	06	03
	150/1D	00	04	62
	322/3	00	01	18
	46/3	00	10	65
	145/2A	00	08	98
	324/3	00	03	19
	324/4	00	10	99
	146/3	00	04	54
	61/5	00	03	27
	322/1	00	18	99
	154/6	00	19	51
	150/1B	00	08	06
	150/1C	00	15	18
	24/1B	00	31	56
	146/1	00	01	52
	19/15	00	15	27

Mandal : Bapulapadu	District : Krishna	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) Billanapalli	1A2/1	00	48	72
	9/1	00	00	37
	4	00	19	36
	3	00	16	64
	8	00	85	47
	10/1	00	00	70
	9/2B	00	33	81
	5	00	24	19
	10/2A	00	02	32
	9/2A	00	34	63
2) Medicherla	29/1C	00	22	52
	9/2	00	33	56
	10/1	00	23	11
	146/1	00	30	19
	22/2	00	46	04
	1 (Forest Land)	05	26	65
	106 (Government Land)	00	03	81
	341/4 (Forest Land)	00	28	88
	107	00	55	81
	143	00	96	07
	27/2	00	39	76
	9/1	00	25	04
	29/1D	00	05	22

1	2	3	4	5
2) Medicherla (Contd .)	358	00	17	91
	29/1B	00	19	78
	29/1A	00	01	41
	29/2	00	23	21
	28 (Crossing Land)	00	00	31
	131/5 (Government Land)	00	02	94
	128/5	00	26	71
	131/2	00	03	20
	131/4 (Government Land)	00	03	20
	144	00	38	62
	27/1	00	08	37
	11/1B	00	18	40
	12 (Crossing Land)	00	00	23
	23 (Crossing Land)	00	00	54
	8	00	00	10
	115	00	24	49
	114	00	51	42
	131/3	00	27	64
	132/1	00	53	61
	341/2	00	08	61
	16 (Crossing Land)	00	08	28
	132/3	00	54	76
	11/2	00	26	97
	11/1A	00	00	53
	21/1	00	01	17
	22/1	00	15	17
	10/2	00	01	17

Mandal : Eluru	District : West Godavari	State	Andhra Pradesh
1) Chodimella	39 (Crossing Land)	00	14 00
	42/3	00	05 84
	38/1	00	03 77
	105/1	00	28 81
	127/1,127/2,127/3,127/4,127/5A,1 27/5B,127/6	00	69 26
	50/3	00	04 55
	37/3	00	03 04
	38/2	00	01 84
	51/1	00	14 77
	37/4	00	43 66
	128 (Crossing Land)	00	06 84
	51/2	00	42 39
	49/1	00	23 36
	109 (Crossing Land)	00	00 10

1	2	3	4	5
1) Chodimella (Contd....)	105/3	00	37	41
	46	00	02	98
	48	00	17	81
	115	00	10	89
	41/8	00	05	93
	106/3	00	19	80
	42/4	00	04	12
	42/5	00	04	55
	42/10	00	06	99
	40/8	00	00	10
	36/2	00	21	76
	105/2 (Crossing Land)	00	09	14
	45 (Crossing Land)	00	16	93
	107 (Crossing Land)	00	11	34
	43/4	00	20	35
	47 (Government Land)	00	37	25
	106/4	00	00	10
	108 (Crossing Land)	00	15	30
	114/2	00	00	47
	114/1	00	05	76
	106/2	00	00	22
	84	00	00	90
	53/1	00	00	10
	41/7	00	03	05

Mandal : Nuzvid	District : Krishna	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) Morsapudi	185/5	00	04	39
	181/1	00	04	90
	241/1	00	22	90
	181/3	00	11	79
	181/4	00	00	10
	167/1B,167/2	00	32	85
	241/2	00	03	65
	206/4	00	30	14
	211/1	00	11	44
	181/6	00	48	70
	242/2A	00	23	51
	218 (Crossing Land)	00	08	81
	291 (Crossing Land)	00	07	00
	210/2.	00	25	07
	181/7	00	01	49
	296/2 (Crossing Land)	00	14	47
	294	00	00	15
	300 (Crossing Land)	00	03	60

1	2	3	4	5
1) Morsapudi (Contd....)	182/2	00	74	03
	186 (Crossing Land)	00	06	44
	169 (Crossing Land)	00	08	72
	183	00	27	59
	292 (Crossing Land)	00	01	36
	210/3	00	28	70
	206/5	00	01	04
	290/1	00	16	24
	290/2	00	19	10
	210/4	00	01	92
	209/4	00	10	66
	209/3	00	18	63
	209/2	00	24	57
	295/3B	00	11	73
	242/2B	00	19	19
	299 (Crossing Land)	00	00	56
	181/2	00	08	82
	210/1	00	23	83
	296/1B	00	06	61
2) Polasanapalli	32 (Government Land)	00	03	78
	25/7	00	03	80
	33/6	00	23	91
	25/6	00	14	80
	13/1A, 13/1A2, 13/1A3, 13/1A4, 13/1 B, 13/2, 13/3, 13/4A, 13/4B, 13/5B, 13 /6B, 13/7B, 13/8B, 13/9B, 13/10B, 13/ 11, 13/12B	00	61	05
	17/11	00	10	43
	25/8	00	00	10
	15/2	00	08	31
	15/3	00	07	72
	26/12	00	42	72
	17/9	00	00	96
	25/9	00	19	79
	16/6	00	13	48
	19/1	00	00	10
	33/5	00	03	91
	21/3	00	13	81
	21/4A	00	11	78
	25/10	00	05	30
	16/8	00	09	98
	19/2	00	15	87
	17/10	00	15	99
	21/6 (Government Land)	00	03	14

1	2	3	4	5
2) Polasanapalli (Contd....)				
	15/1	00	04	61
	21/4B	00	15	62
	20/5	00	00	10
	20/4	00	07	75
	21/5	00	22	24
	21/1	00	00	93
	21/2	00	09	35
	16/7	00	19	80
	20/2	00	03	44
	25/1	00	03	81
	16/5	00	01	42
3) Ravicherala				
	106	00	37	92
	211/3	00	07	67
	71/4	00	40	38
	151	00	25	57
	73	00	36	47
	57/3	00	00	63
	57/2	00	06	25
	107/1,107/2	00	02	02
	229/4	00	02	34
	104	00	60	65
	103	00	48	47
	88	00	00	24
	71/2	00	01	70
	87	00	04	20
	92	00	75	84
	142	00	00	75
	108/2	00	09	67
	231/1	00	04	12
	223	00	03	96
	224/2A,224/2B	00	63	95
	229/5	00	02	56
	86	00	97	42
	228/6	00	50	06
	60/1	00	04	52
	70/3	00	08	34
	70/6	00	02	31
	70/5	00	20	11
	70/4	00	25	39
	59/1	00	11	57
	69/3	00	02	39
	253/1	00	11	79
	152/1	00	31	07

1	2	3	4	5
3) Ravicherala (Contd....)	211/6	00	01	97
	149/1	00	72	54
	150/1	00	28	18
	61	00	29	99
	108/3	00	40	48
	152/2	00	01	84
	62/6	00	17	13
	93	00	00	99
	58/1,58/2,58/3,58/4,58/5,58/6,58/7 .58/8,58/9,58/10,58/11	00	37	21
	57/4	00	00	98
	55/7	00	04	59
	55/6	00	02	12
	49/4	00	01	48
	49/7	00	02	50
	49/5	00	13	65
	62/7	00	22	29
	57/1	00	15	61
	268/1 (Government Land)	00	00	49
	54 (Crossing Land)	00	09	24
	90 (Crossing Land)	00	05	80
	150/2 (Crossing Land)	00	00	78
	229/7	00	13	08
	229/6	00	15	10
	63 (Crossing Land)	00	04	93
	253/4 (Government Land)	00	00	60
	253/3	00	19	87
	Between Survey number 61 and Survey number 63 (Crossing Land)	00	15	30
	136 (Crossing Land)	00	04	45
	82 (Crossing Land)	00	15	51
	224/3 (Government Land)	00	00	10
	56 (Crossing Land)	00	09	19
	72 (Crossing Land)	00	14	99
	132 (Government Land)	00	24	73
	253/2	00	11	34
	71/3 (Crossing Land)	00	01	16
	49/6 (Crossing Land)	00	05	48
	211/1 (Crossing Land)	00	04	38
	212/1,212/2,212/3,212/4,212/5,21 2/6,212/7,212/8,212/9,212/10,212/ 11,212/12,212/13,212/14,212/15,2 12/16,212/17	00	14	00
	268/2	00	35	00
	269	00	28	00

1	2	3	4	5
3) Ravicheraia (Contd....)				
251/2	00	15	93	
264/7	00	21	77	
264/8	00	10	74	
264/5	00	15	91	
264/3	00	13	53	
264/4	00	13	76	
83 (Crossing Land)	00	01	80	
211/2	00	00	10	
229/2	00	00	10	
210/2	00	06	26	
210/1	00	07	95	
210/7	00	04	41	
210/8	00	10	15	
216/2	00	12	87	
211/4	00	13	35	
246/3	00	27	86	
210/3	00	04	17	
91 (Crossing Land)	00	06	53	
247/2	00	17	39	
251/3	00	12	05	
251/1	00	22	76	
247/3	00	29	23	
210/9	00	00	87	
231/2	00	10	79	
210/4	00	00	10	
211/5	00	11	29	
235/1	00	22	51	
230/1	00	15	34	
247/1	00	12	17	
230/2	00	01	84	
216/1	00	78	57	
231/3	00	13	50	
232/1,232/2,232/3,232/4,232/5,23 2/6	00	01	84	
231/4	00	45	74	
231/5	00	20	40	
246/1	00	23	17	
4) Vempadu				
220	00	26	57	
111/2	00	32	38	
222/1	00	06	15	
178	01	19	09	
53/2	00	06	68	
52/3	00	00	10	
177	00	31	34	

1	2	3	4	5
4) Vempadu (Contd....)	179	00	46	14
	110	00	46	96
	24/4	00	07	97
	30/2	00	04	83
	221	00	39	71
	82/3	00	18	97
	22/2	00	04	36
	29	00	29	47
	32	00	01	10
	20/2	00	01	95
	30/1	00	03	05
	84/3	00	23	35
	50/2	00	18	09
	82/2	00	08	85
	82/4	00	08	66
	84/4	00	14	71
	112	00	06	20
	264	00	54	10
	263	00	47	05
	108	00	07	74
	262	00	00	55
	30/3	00	36	08
	111/1	00	41	88
	50/1	00	25	50
	80 (Crossing Land)	00	04	31
	33/2	00	04	56
	22/1	00	13	66
	82/1	00	05	34
	61/1	00	30	99
	84/2	00	09	42
	23 (Government Land)	00	14	68
	180	00	50	86
	44 (Crossing Land)	00	04	08
	187	00	66	71
	Between Survey number 111 and Survey number 112 (Crossing Land)	00	05	36
	Between Survey number 162 and Survey number 163 (Crossing Land)	00	02	40
	186 (Crossing Land)	00	04	55
	163 (Crossing Land)	00	08	82
	52/1	00	22	01
	53/1	00	18	32
	52/2	00	20	86

1	2	3	4	5
4) Vempadu (Contd....)	22/3	00	05	66
	33/1	00	24	90
	161	00	01	03
	162	01	37	56
	189	00	00	69
	190	00	64	77
	196	00	17	94
	84/6	00	00	35
	83	00	49	23
	24/2	00	28	14
	84/7	00	23	16
	84/5	00	16	18
	20/3	00	64	40
	21/1	00	14	58
	21/2	00	00	84
	22/4	00	22	26
	188	00	49	40

Mandal : Pedavegi	District : West Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh	
1) Jagannadhapuram	359/1	00	13 89
	367	00	00 10
	364	00	11 04
	356	00	37 66
	355	00	14 01
	359/2B	00	00 57
	359/2A	00	22 75
	366 (Crossing Land)	00	10 32
	358 (Crossing Land)	00	26 36
	365 (Crossing Land)	00	05 41
2) Koppaka	120/1	00	02 89
	154/4	00	20 56
	118	00	25 66
	160/8	00	00 18
	153	00	05 24
	159/2	00	00 10
	987 (Crossing Land)	00	09 53
	225/2	00	01 98
	225/1	00	25 90
	226/6	00	02 18
	226/8	00	21 96
	983 (Crossing Land)	00	05 29
	159/3	00	18 30
	157/1	00	11 23
	120/6	00	22 90

1	2	3	4	5
2) Koppaka (Contd....)	989 (Crossing Land)	00	03	39
	1009/2B	00	48	78
	196/3	00	11	28
	120/5	00	14	86
	120/4	00	15	78
	120/3	00	12	55
	197/4	00	12	05
	158	00	04	24
	205/2 (Crossing Land)	00	02	82
	192/2 (Crossing Land)	00	00	10
	120/7	00	03	54
	116/2	00	01	34
	203/5	00	01	56
	205/1	00	22	89
	197/3	00	04	12
	193	00	08	34
	218/7	00	04	85
	1010/1	00	32	43
	154/5	00	04	37
	785/1	00	25	90
	203/3	00	21	60
	788/1	00	03	11
	788/4	00	15	48
	788/3	00	26	42
	1008/2	00	00	10
	205/3	00	26	82
	1009/2A	00	07	93
	117	00	36	48
	191/6	00	24	90
	194/4	00	01	64
	977	00	44	56
	194/1	00	00	15
	998	00	41	58
	1010/3	00	00	10
	195/2	00	38	43
	1010/2	00	14	84
	191/5	00	00	10
	203/4	00	17	62
	191/7	00	10	76
	192/1	00	00	16
	189	00	04	71
	195/1	00	17	19
	202/1	00	08	70

1	2	3	4	5
2) Kopaka (Contd....)				
	203/2	00	03	61
	120/2	00	08	59
	210/5	00	16	75
	156/2	00	14	48
	956/3	00	12	71
	1073/2 (Forest Land)	00	02	02
	1050/4 (Forest Land)	00	01	54
	1072 (Forest Land)	00	00	10
	1071/1 (Forest Land)	00	46	63
	157/2	00	09	00
	156/3	00	07	11
	218/4	00	00	73
	152	00	00	10
	154/2	00	14	41
	154/1	00	10	87
	788/2	00	17	50
	156/1	00	10	29
	157/4	00	00	10
	956/5A,956/5B,956/5C	00	00	28
	1061/4 (Forest Land)	00	33	19
	1009/1 (Government Land)	00	10	22
	1008/1 (Government Land)	00	05	69
	1063 (Government Land)	00	39	77
	215 (Government Land)	00	04	68
	228 (Government Land)	00	10	49
	1071/2 (Forest Land)	00	05	63
	1066 (Forest Land)	00	83	92
	956/4	00	24	81
	1061/3 (Forest Land)	00	03	37
	1050/3 (Forest Land)	00	17	30
	1050/2 (Forest Land)	00	28	43
	1073/1 (Forest Land)	00	51	38
	1049 (Forest Land)	00	47	61
	1051/4 (Forest Land)	00	16	85
	1062 (Forest Land)	00	39	68
	197/6	00	10	10
	956/1	00	01	11
	197/1	00	21	22
	218/6	00	17	74
	218/5	00	14	65
	789/3	00	04	46
	1006/4	00	26	54
	197/5	00	08	48

1	2	3	4	5
2) Koppaka (Contd...)	224/4	00	02	31
	956/2A,956/2B	00	21	42
	197/7	00	11	87
	156/4	00	00	10
	224/1	00	10	79
	226/3	00	00	68
	789/1	00	24	39
	224/2	00	07	54
	226/7	00	17	25
	197/2	00	00	10
	226/10	00	00	11
	226/9	00	03	15
	1006/3B	00	11	27
3) Pinakadimi	61/2	00	02	47
	61/1	00	72	13
	53 (Government Land)	00	00	97
	48/1A	00	21	28
	54 (Government Land)	00	06	20
	46/5 (Government Land)	00	00	32
	29 (Government Land)	00	14	84
	1/1 (Government Land)	00	40	54
	47/1B	00	05	13
	35	00	51	21
	52/6A	00	00	26
	20/1	00	11	64
	60/3	00	11	80
	21/2	00	06	37
	20/4	00	09	52
	22/4	00	40	12
	55/2A	00	02	45
	48/1B	00	01	11
	52/2	00	01	73
	52/1	00	14	50
	52/3	00	02	04
	21/3	00	11	47
	28/3	00	00	10
	36 (Crossing Land)	00	07	78
	28/4	00	06	07
	28/5	00	17	89
	21/1	00	06	11
	31/1	00	39	31
	20/6	00	02	58
	55/1B	00	01	59

1	2	3	4	5
3) Pinakadimi (Contd....)	20/2	00	12	99
	47/2A,47/2B	00	00	18
4) Vanguru	161 (Crossing Land)	00	09	46
	103/2	00	03	09
	192 (Crossing Land)	00	11	49
	104/1	00	19	28
	91/5B (Crossing Land)	00	07	40
	160 (Crossing Land)	00	05	37
	91/5C	00	03	46
	88 (Crossing Land)	00	07	16
	186	00	11	26
	91/5A	00	11	65
	181/2	00	13	85
	159/2	00	31	51
	174/1,174/2,174/3,174/4,174/5,17	00	09	70
	4/6			
	175/2	00	09	79
	176/2B	00	17	16
	176/2A	00	14	82
	95	00	17	57
	182	00	17	68
	203/1	00	02	26
	189	00	20	34
	159/1	00	10	57
	39/6	00	03	93
	39/5	00	11	52
	39/4	00	11	62
	183	00	27	54
	170/2	00	06	15
	191/3	00	11	78
	92/2	00	19	36
	92/4 (Crossing Land)	00	02	34
	93	00	08	85
	87/2A,87/2B	00	00	18
	94/1	00	22	24
	170/3	00	23	70
	87/1	00	38	42
	190/2	00	27	98
	181/3	00	06	00
	191/2	00	07	85
	203/2	00	15	71
	203/3	00	00	38
	171/2	00	45	38
	39/3	00	11	56
	92/3	00	06	92
	190/3	00	22	00

नई दिल्ली, 11 जून, 2003

का. आ. 1651.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स गैस ट्रांस्पोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड की संवर्धक कम्पनी मसर्स रिलाइंस इण्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड गोवा के उत्तरी/दक्षिणी अपतट के खोज ब्लाकों से आन्ध्र प्रदेश की संरचनाओं से आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्यके पूर्वी गोदावरी और पश्चमी गोदावरी जिले में विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मेसर्स गैस ट्रांस्पोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः ,अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962) (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री पी.वी.रमणा, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जी.टी.आई.सी.एल. पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 3-20-7/1, राम मोहन राजा नगर, काकिनाडा 533003 पूर्वी गोदावरी जिला आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

अनुसूची

मंडल : गाँव का नाम	जिल्हा : दूसरे गोदावरि सर्वे सं.। सब डिविजन सं.	राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश एरिया			
		हेक्टर	एर	सि एर	
		1	2	3	4
1) बडुगुनियानिलंक	61/6	00	09	15	
	61/9	00	15	57	
	59 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	20	
	63/4	00	54	27	
	134 (गवनमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	01	44	79	
	40/4 (गवनमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	07	40	
	44/3	00	39	29	
	44/2	00	06	65	
	44/1	00	07	19	
	38/6	00	27	94	
	60 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	29	90	
	133 (गवनमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	01	44	72	
	44/5	00	32	70	
	38/5	00	01	59	
	40/2	00	03	49	
	40/3	00	45	53	
	40/5	00	09	29	
	54/2	00	43	07	
	63/3	00	35	72	
	61/8	00	10	32	
	43/1	00	23	68	
2) गोतमि गोदावरि रिवर	नदी दो गाँव के बीछ मे (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	03	81	81	
3) मडिकि	98/2	00	09	18	
	32	00	75	89	
	31/1	00	23	10	
	37/2	00	04	42	
	167/1	00	14	54	
	37/3	00	17	81	
	38/3	00	14	23	
	38/4	00	20	64	
	14/2	00	05	15	
	40/1	00	10	42	
	96/4	00	00	87	
	97/2	00	01	32	
	88 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	33	
	15/1 (गवनमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	00	46	
	96/5	00	20	25	
	31/2	00	02	84	

1	2	3	4	5
3) मण्डिकि (निरंतर)	47/2	00	28	99
	47/3	00	10	06
	47/5	00	00	10
	47/4	00	18	09
	39/7ए	00	02	17
	171/4ए (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	48
	39/6	00	16	22
	95/4	00	19	31
	171/1बि (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	72
	22 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	01
	167/5 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	79
	39/7बि (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	71
	98/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	03
	97/1	00	30	59
	172/2	00	26	33
	171/13बि	00	03	04
	171/11बि	00	07	30
	21/6	00	13	78
	172/5	00	13	07
	38/5	00	09	61
	16/4	00	14	95
	39/5	00	09	57
	171/14	00	10	88
	172/1	00	39	82
	170/1	00	14	53
	168/5	00	24	88
	168/4	00	17	82
	166/2	00	00	10
	167/4	00	17	84
	14/3	00	28	47
	95/3	00	12	23
	38/2	00	01	06
	95/2	00	28	37
	21/5	00	11	60
	21/4	00	00	10
	16/6	00	00	74
	16/5	00	31	51
	93/1	00	41	26
	89/1	00	01	17
	89/2	00	21	35
	89/3	00	20	40
	89/4	00	00	61
	95/5	00	25	66

1	2	3	4	5
मंडलः आतेयपुरम	जिल्हा : इस्ट गोदावरी		राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश	
1) आतेयपुरम	20/9	00	03	47
	20/7ए	00	12	63
	20/6ए	00	27	90
	18/5सि	00	09	46
	18/4सि	00	06	37
	20/5	00	04	97
	79/1	00	33	03
	20/6खि (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	55
	29/2ए (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	84
	29/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	03
	28 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	10	69
	18/1खि (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	56
	18/7सि	00	22	30
	16/1	00	01	71
	78 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	61
	18/2ए	00	05	64
	29/2खि	00	04	22
	16/8	00	01	31
	29/4खि	00	03	43
	29/3खि	00	04	10
	18/6सि	00	06	33
	18/10	00	00	10
	18/9	00	01	40
	18/8सि	00	07	68
	20/6सि	00	00	10
	79/2	00	19	57
	20/4	00	00	28
	18/2खि (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	01	83
	16/7ए, 16/7खि (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	24	62
	16/6	00	10	91
	20/3	00	00	10
	77/1	00	07	46
	20/11	00	20	61
	18/8ए	00	04	20
	77/2	00	01	76
	79/3	00	04	28
	20/12	00	02	61
	20/10	00	03	62
2) वसंतवाड	68/3	00	00	45
	72/18सि	00	05	51
	72/19सि	00	01	43
	72/20	00	14	60

1	2	3	4	5
2) वसंतवाड (निरंतर)	64/3 (गवनमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	34	51
	71/16	00	00	10
	71/1	00	19	42
	107/1	00	59	05
	71/7ए (गवनमेन्ट ल्यान्ड)	00	01	21
	72/16	00	00	40
	67/18	00	00	10
	70/5	00	28	02
	67/12	00	04	70
	71/2ए	00	05	82
	70/6	00	00	10
	64/1	00	00	17
	67/17	00	10	40
	67/16	00	04	20
	67/15	00	09	15
	72/17सि	00	03	20
	67/13	00	06	67
	70/4	00	07	34
	67/11	00	02	37
	67/10	00	01	16
	67/9	00	00	37
	67/19	00	12	42
	109/8	00	43	04
	68/2	00	05	01
	72/15ए	00	00	10
	67/14	00	03	69
	72/4ए (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	12
	65/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	96
	68/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	24
	117/1, 117/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	54
	108	00	38	35
	69 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	05
	72/18ए	00	05	36
	72/17ए	00	05	68
	72/19ए	00	00	10
	64/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	11	84
	65/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	25
3) वशिष्ट गोदावरि रिवर	नदी दो गाँव के बीछ मे (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	03	23	93
4) युच्चलि	55/4	00	04	13
	37/1	00	03	27
	37/4ए	00	09	58
	40/2	00	07	73
	39/7	00	18	03

1	2	3	4	5
4) वृच्छिलि (निरंतर)	55/2	00	00	10
	24 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	57
	37/3	00	07	45
	38/1	00	19	95
	60 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	44
	37/2 बि	00	17	19
	54 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	33	58
	25/6	00	08	60
	40/1	00	03	88
	25/7	00	47	03
	61/3	00	23	53
	55/3भवि	00	00	38
	39/5	00	38	98
	55/3ए	00	03	00
	41 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	43

मंडलः कडियम	जिल्हा : इस्ट गोदावरी	राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश		
1) मुरुमंडा	146	00	20	67
	246/9	00	08	53
	246/15	00	02	96
	247/3	00	19	61
	247/1	00	13	65
	247/2	00	10	12
	248/1	00	02	71
	144/2	00	08	58
	390/4	00	00	12
	65/3	00	07	66
	390/8	00	07	03
	246/6	00	07	78
	390/5	00	04	89
	247/4	00	06	12
	150/2	00	20	34
	151/2	00	10	69
	392/3	00	23	40
	390/6	00	12	32
	145/4	00	01	63
	89/4	00	08	23
	143/2	00	00	17
	144/3	00	07	77
	144/1	00	00	10
	151/3	00	11	70
	150/1	00	08	13
	145/6	00	09	67
	151/4	00	10	41

1	2	3	4	5
1) मुमांडा (सिरंतर)	154/1	00	41	36
	154/2	00	03	60
	41/4	00	01	53
	41/3	00	00	10
	143/1	00	04	52
	145/5	00	09	46
	144/4	00	20	72
	363/2	00	03	47
	246/7	00	08	32
	374	00	00	82
	363/4	00	33	31
	271/2	00	23	72
	390/9	00	13	43
	402/2	00	28	55
	364	00	31	52
	69/2	00	30	01
	365	00	36	17
	392/1	00	14	19
	390/3	00	14	45
	345/2	00	33	78
	344/1	00	21	90
	269/3	00	00	75
	392/2	00	09	93
	402/1	00	18	35
	367	00	25	41
	270/2	00	00	10
	275	00	00	10
	274/2	00	16	95
	271/3	00	00	50
	348/1	00	00	48
	271/1	00	02	94
	363/1	00	04	41
	368	00	15	59
	389/4	00	13	51
	369/2	00	02	79
	369/1	00	11	91
	369/3	00	06	55
	369/4	00	05	98
	369/6	00	01	24
	370/1	00	21	99
	246/5	00	08	62
	261/2	00	47	93
	348/2	00	25	40

1	2	3	4	5
1) मुमांडा (निरंतर)	389/7	00	07	63
	389/1	00	10	55
	389/10	00	00	10
	389/8	00	31	46
	269/2	00	14	39
	389/3	00	12	48
	262	00	45	60
	90/1	00	00	12
	260	00	00	10
	390/2	00	14	12
	272/1	00	27	35
	270/1	00	16	16
	363/5	00	04	29
	390/7	00	00	73
	269/1	00	15	50
	85/2	00	05	47
	246/4	00	00	10
	89/5	00	11	30
	88/1	00	00	10
	87	00	34	30
	84	00	09	51
	85/5	00	09	63
	389/2	00	01	55
	85/6	00	14	94
	388/5	00	02	68
	83/2	00	09	12
	83/1	00	14	71
	61/3	00	09	53
	65/4	00	41	27
	89/2	00	20	65
	65/2	00	00	50
	85/4	00	02	14
	153 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	86
	62 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	49
	43 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	04
	139 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	26
	342 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	13
	142 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	77

मंडलः मंडपेटा	जिल्हा : दूस्ट गोदावरि	राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश
1) एडिदा	94/1	00 04 77
	41/2	00 00 10
	41/3	00 14 40
	45/1	00 03 57

1	2	3	4	5
१) एडिटा (निरंतर)	81/3	00	04	54
	76/1	00	09	10
	81/4	00	10	87
	103/2	00	19	45
	44/1	00	31	50
	94/2	00	21	51
	40/2	00	22	61
	94/3	00	18	29
	94/4	00	09	30
	98/3	00	18	80
	95/1	00	01	53
	38/1	00	13	53
	96/3ए	00	09	66
	97/7	00	00	10
	96/2	00	21	51
	96/1	00	00	51
	81/2	00	19	67
	36/2बि	00	05	13
	105 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	11	50
	39	00	21	42
	43 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	75
	37 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	67
	40/1	00	03	03
	42 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	08
	82 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	08
	101 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	20	14

मंडलः पेरवलि	जिल्हा १ : वेस्ट गोदावरी	राज्य २ : आन्ध्र प्रदेश		
1) कानूू अप्रहारम	34 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	48
	7/3ए2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	68
	7/3बि (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	10
	7/1	00	12	02
	7/2	00	10	07
	8/2सि	00	01	21
	8/2डि	00	39	54
	5	00	00	29
	8/2डि (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	64
	7/3ए1	00	07	30
	सर्वे सीमा और सर्वे नंबर 34 के बीच मे (गर्व	00	08	55
	सर्वे सीमा और सर्वे नंबर 5 के बीच मे (गर्वन	03	25	69
2) कानूू जमिंदारि	187/6	00	09	69
	187/8सि	00	07	23
	187/3	00	03	59
	187/4	00	05	52

1	2	3	4	5
2) कानून जमिंदारी (निरंतर)	187/8बि	00	00	31
	196/4	00	06	35
	187/7	00	08	30
	186/9डि	00	00	35
	187/5	00	06	88
	173	00	00	30
	353	00	25	72
	196/3	00	06	68
	197/3	00	23	65
	197/6	00	16	50
	169/15	00	09	20
	31 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	76
	207/8	00	00	79
	354	01	78	35
	32/7 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	00
	187/10	00	00	38
	32/2	00	01	22
	33/2	00	03	82
	174/4	00	25	36
	207/3	00	13	86
	207/2बि	00	13	13
	207/2ए	00	02	16
	169/5	00	07	83
	174/3	00	02	11
	169/3	00	01	08
	34 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	49
	169/2	00	10	03
	169/1	00	07	77
	171/3	00	00	28
	170/1	00	28	69
	175/7	00	23	21
	207/7	00	03	80
	169/4	00	05	09
	204/1	00	17	83
	169/6	00	27	15
	207/9बि	00	09	01
	207/1	00	00	78
	196/1	00	04	43
	196/5ए, 196/5बि, 196/5सि, 19	00	15	30
	204/3बि	00	15	89
	207/9ए	00	07	50
	204/2	00	14	52
	169/14	00	02	32

1	2	3	4	5
2) कानू जमिदारि (निरंतर)	206/3 206/2 206/1बि 206/4 188 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 207/6 204/3ए 187/9 33/5 360 33/6 30/2 32/1 33/7 33/4 196/2 355 33/3	00 00	14 13 04 11 08 03 10 24 05 19 01 08 07 00 22 04 52 02	70 65 54 01 91 49 67 57 93 48 34 21 58 10 86 66 53 10
3) नाइपल्ले	14/1 44/8 154/5 53/1बि 149/6 14/4 29/10ए 29/9 29/10बि 53/1ए 15/2 2 45/2 154/4 43/3ए, 43/3बि 54/5 43/4 49/8 43/5 43/6 49/7 40/11 41/5 45/1 72/4 54/4	00 00	12 00 01 01 00 01 08 03 07 09 23 14 06 18 00 12 06 19 04 05 00 09 10 12 09	48 23 50 79 76 63 13 79 90 70 76 90 58 23 10 43 60 04 95 86 40 41 50 32 95

1	2	3	4	5
3) नाडुपल्ले (निरंतर)	154/3	00	18	18
	75/1	00	02	36
	75/2	00	13	36
	16/8ए	00	12	81
	73/7	00	09	54
	154/7	00	05	92
	73/5	00	13	80
	16/6	00	16	85
	154/6	00	03	87
	72/7बि	00	00	42
	73/8	00	14	67
	72/5	00	10	03
	15/18बि	00	16	31
	72/2	00	06	24
	77/1	00	13	10
	74/6	00	22	85
	17/6	00	00	10
	73/4	00	03	01
	77/3	00	00	10
	154/10ए	00	01	93
	14/2	00	12	98
	15/18ए	00	05	78
	50/2बि	00	00	21
	54/1सि	00	15	36
	72/7ए	00	03	16
	15/21	00	07	76
	50/3	00	14	83
	54/2	00	08	46
	149/4	00	00	10
	149/1	00	07	70
	149/2	00	08	53
	29/11	00	10	02
	47 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	25	34
	150/2	00	07	61
	89 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	09	13
	42/4	00	01	30
	43/8	00	09	63
	50/4	00	25	69
	41/4	00	17	66
	149/5	00	10	78
	16/5	00	01	16
	54/1बि	00	00	54
	54/1ए	00	06	78

1	2	3	4	5
3) नाइपल्ट (निगर)	150/1एफ	00	14	43
	41/2	00	08	77
	72/3	00	11	58
	149/3	00	10	40
	154/8	00	09	26
	42/5	00	12	42
	150/6	00	11	46
	150/7	00	17	23
	150/1इ	00	00	33
	16/8वि	00	12	18
	97	00	29	50
	52 (कार्पेट ल्यान्ड)	00	19	56
	151	00	25	66
	153/6	00	17	86
	11 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	01
	74/5	00	09	97
	153/5वि	00	06	90
	43/7	00	14	46
	155/9	00	00	10
	154/2	00	02	59
	41/6	00	12	74
	43/9	00	11	05
	41/3	00	05	86
	16/7	00	25	04
	72/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	48

मंडलः ताडेपल्लि गूडेम	जिल्हा : वेस्ट गोदावरी	राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश		
11 उग्नीकुम	510/6	00	00	10
	504	00	05	64
	733/2	00	24	19
	575/2	00	36	51
	690/2	00	00	10
	630/9	00	06	24
	687/4सि	00	02	34
	522/6	00	08	36
	683/2	00	06	23
	694/1इ	00	03	20
	694/2ए	00	23	97
	694/2वि	00	15	62
	523/3वि	00	27	18
	630/5	00	07	24
	523/3एफ	00	00	39
	522/3	00	16	32
	522/4	00	14	41

1	2	3	4	5
1) आहुगोलनु (निरंतर)	629/3ए, 629/3बि	00	02	91
	802/2	00	04	15
	635/7	00	37	05
	681/4	00	03	89
	681/3	00	07	35
	681/2	00	18	03
	681/1	00	10	32
	636/4बि	00	03	91
	636/4ए	00	00	48
	733/1	00	11	26
	687/4डि	00	05	64
	522/2	00	38	28
	579/4 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	21	60
	736/1ए	00	00	22
	802/3	00	08	30
	629/2ए	00	03	36
	630/4	00	03	20
	683/1	00	09	42
	686 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	70
	694/1बि	00	02	80
	522/5 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	88
	598/2.	00	07	06
	603 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	23	24
	629/4डि	00	07	73
	606 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	93
	576 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	55	65
	691/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	11	11
	698 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	10	35
	574 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	54
	602 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	12	27
	597 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	36
	371 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	08
	627/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	22	22
	630/7	00	00	12
	693/1	00	12	27
	689/2	00	04	36
	689/1ए, 689/1बि	00	06	84
	694/2सि	00	09	96
	635/6	00	18	32
	631	00	33	83
	632/4	00	01	98
	632/3	00	05	24
	598/1	00	89	80

1	2	3	4	5
1) आगोलनु (निरंतर)	503	00	28	86
	693/2ए	00	11	03
	802/1	00	07	14
	630/10	00	16	52
	630/12	00	02	00
	630/11	00	06	07
	629/5बि	00	03	08
	629/5ए	00	02	38
	629/4द्वि	00	01	29
	629/4सि	00	03	06
	632/2डि	00	04	35
	692/1द्वि	00	05	68
	359/10	00	10	94
	600	00	30	00
	370/4	00	10	09
	370/3सि	00	15	18
	629/1	00	01	26
	690/5	00	05	34
	370/2	00	07	42
	692/1ए	00	07	22
	370/3द्वि	00	06	83
	370/3ए	00	04	61
	369/1सि	00	01	56
	601/1ए	00	05	60
	372/1	00	12	20
	369/1द्वि	00	02	72
	369/2ए	00	16	06
	601/1द्वि	00	00	93
	367/2ए	00	43	50
	369/1ए	00	00	80
	367/2द्वि	00	18	36
	629/2द्वि	00	03	64
	368/4	00	18	24
	525/1	00	63	47
	368/3	00	17	80
	369/2द्वि	00	19	92
	526/4डि	00	01	05
	523/1	00	13	54
	601/2ए	00	02	07
	372/2	00	11	29
	690/3द्वि	00	02	08
	523/3ए	00	17	52
	523/2	00	01	44

1	2	3	4	5
1) आरुगोलनु (निरंतर)	601/1एफ 367/3 601/1इ 601/1सि 795 595/2 596	00 00 00 00 00 00 00	08 03 03 04 44 02 29	84 24 98 73 46 70 95
2) अरुल्ला अग्रहारम	10/3एफ 203/3 189 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 203/5 182 252 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 181/7ए, 181/7बि 180/4 264/2 180/5 179 273 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 178/1 208/2 264/3 206/10 265/13 206/9 206/7 265/12 205 175 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 183 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 208/3 185/3बि 92 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 265/8अ 188 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 263/7 262/1 262/2 204/2 295/3 295/1ए, 295/1बि, 295/1सि 87 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 265/5	00 00	00 00 02 22 11 08 22 01 22 36 11 15 01 24 11 09 26 08 17 06 41 20 05 10 00 07 00 01 15 02 02 02 00 15 14 02 01 01	67 93 28 93 72 75 84 27 32 10 77 31 21 04 23 71 17 32 61 28 85 14 28 10 69 19 60 62 44 04 95 83 51 42 74

1	2	3	4	5
2) अरुल्ला अग्नहारम् (निरंतर)	137 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	25	09
	136 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	03	11
	203/4	00	23	78
	264/4	00	00	13
	13/4ए, 13/4बि, 13/4सि	00	17	29
	13/3	00	00	46
	204/1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	73
	144/2	00	11	09
	145/2ए, 145/2बि	00	05	86
	14/4	00	32	55
	91/1	00	23	55
	204/4 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	02	50
	90/9ए, 90/9बि	00	00	85
	251/4	00	15	20
	11/1	00	22	17
	251/7	00	00	31
	14/2	00	15	65
	15	00	12	92
	265/4	00	04	21
	13/1ए, 13/1बि	00	17	22
	265/7	00	09	23
	10/3इ	00	06	24
	12/1	00	12	80
	13/2	00	04	64
	10/4	00	10	33
	145/1	00	04	43
	265/6	00	02	60
	185/3ए	00	42	01
	91/2	00	00	45
	140/1	00	23	73
	201/1	00	01	34
	144/3	00	07	16
	144/1	00	05	01
	145/3	00	10	43
	251/2	00	05	11
	141/1	00	16	79
	295/2 (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	27	40
	141/2	00	29	77
	142	00	10	00
	143/2	00	55	36
	172	00	31	05
	262/3	00	39	22
	251/6	00	13	51

1	2	3	4	5
6) कुलकलिल (निरंतर)	254 (कासिंग स्थान)	00	04	07
	253/1	00	13	85
	238/2	00	02	58
	238/3	00	29	48
	238/4	00	14	17
	239/5	00	12	71
	239/7	00	27	29
	223/2	00	24	62
	252/1	00	22	74
	223/1	00	01	31
	252/2	00	26	13
	285/1	00	74	09
	253/3	00	02	70
	285/2 (गवर्नमेंट स्थान)	00	02	20
	219	00	22	70
	287/2	00	54	41
	276/2	00	26	63
	276/1	00	22	85
	277/5	00	03	85
	218	00	22	36
	217	00	11	74
	216	00	34	07
	215	00	38	46
	214/3	00	04	28
	214/2	00	15	09
	234	00	18	42
7) नवाखुपल्ले	3/1	00	03	52
	2 (कासिंग स्थान)	00	03	62
	5/2वि	00	11	08
	1 (कासिंग स्थान)	00	16	37
	5/3एफ	00	02	69
	5/2ए	00	07	80
	5/3सि	00	04	37
	5/3ए	00	02	65
	3/2	00	00	33
	5/6वि	00	11	80
	5/5	00	11	13
	5/7	00	00	10
	5/6ए	00	12	34
	5/1	00	00	95
	5/4	00	08	69
	5/3जि	00	05	03
8) ताडेपल्ले	1119/1सि	00	00	53

1	2	3	4	5
8) ताडेपल्ले (निरंतर)	1116 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	14	03
	988/3	00	14	59
	1119/1वि	00	05	35
	1111/1	00	25	17
	1132/3इ	00	09	66
	1121/2वि	00	00	10
	1132/3ड	00	03	42
	1036	00	53	71
	1035/3ए	00	11	57
	1111/2	00	08	99
	1114/3	00	25	17
	1121/1वि	00	01	65
	1120/2वि	00	07	51
	1035/3वि	00	05	97
	1113/2सि	00	09	23
	1121/2इ	00	11	27
	1120/2सि	00	02	55
	1120/1	00	26	35
	1106/1ए	00	03	51
	1120/2ए	00	08	02
	1113/2वि	00	00	35
	1132/3जि	00	03	64
	1114/2	00	03	02
	1133/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	17	04
	1058/3 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	42
	1118 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	01	69
	1119/1ए	00	09	29
	1033 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	08	55
	1120/2इ	00	09	40
	1134/1	00	06	89
	1133/1	00	16	80
	988/2	00	06	78
	1132/3हेच	00	06	58
	1035/2ए	00	03	60
	1132/3एफ	00	00	16
	1120/2ड	00	00	10
	987	00	66	90
	1115/2	00	13	66
	988/1	00	07	37
	1061/1	00	03	33
	989/6	00	00	10
	1035/2सि	00	13	43
	1035/2वि	00	10	59

1	2	3	4	5
8) ताडेपल्ले (निरंतर)	1132/3ए 1029/2 1035/1 1035/4ए 1030/5ए 1030/4ए 1030/4बि 1030/4सि 1030/5बि 1030/2 1029/4 1029/3 1029/8 1029/9 978/1, 978/2, 978/3, 978/4 1115/1 1035/4सि 1030/1	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	02 00 08 07 04 06 11 03 00 05 14 14 09 41 11 21 01 24	47 10 20 80 00 74 43 28 28 98 19 96 00 36 89 66 63 69
9) ताडेपल्लि गूडम	6/1 162/2 6/2	00 00 00	20 11 20	33 22 33

मंडलः उंदुजवरम	जिल्हा : वेस्ट गोदावरी	राज्य : आन्ध्र प्रदेश		
1) दम्मेनु	2/1 1 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 2/2ए	00 00 00	07 07 01	14 79 74
2) काल्दरि	259/7ए 259/8ए 259/3 292/3सि 275/3 275/1 275/2 274/2ए 274/1ए 259/2बि 274/1बि 229/21 272/7 396 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 401 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 293 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड) 257 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	02 02 12 10 29 09 08 07 07 20 05 06 00 02 21 15 03	13 53 40 26 83 35 56 33 72 05 51 78 78 74 44 38 86

1	2	3	4	5
2) कल्दरि (निरंतर)	309 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	12	73
	353 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	05	59
	310 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	45
	352/2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	86
	254/3इ	00	05	66
	259/5ए	00	17	46
	352/1वि	00	28	66
	229/10	00	02	37
	254/5	00	11	93
	254/2	00	09	86
	254/1	00	17	77
	229/22	00	06	62
	229/11	00	08	33
	229/9	00	00	10
	272/6	00	21	88
	254/6	00	05	66
	357/2ए	00	00	19
	274/1सि	00	08	87
	350/4	00	01	94
	385 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	73
	351/5	00	26	76
	351/7	00	22	38
	351/4ए	00	00	10
	342/3	00	21	21
	342/2वि	00	12	27
	342/1वि	00	02	65
	342/1ए	00	00	10
	292/4	00	15	96
	254/4	00	01	31
	273/1	00	00	10
	356	00	36	35
	255/2	00	15	31
	410/1	00	34	25
	311/2ए	00	06	45
	399/3	00	84	44
	352/1ए (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	23	51
	399/2	00	00	10
	400/1वि	00	00	19
	400/1ए	00	17	53
	400/2ए	00	02	07
	386/7वि	00	18	16
	259/6ए	00	01	97
	410/2ए	00	03	06

1	2	3	4	5
2) कालदरि (निरंतर)	311/1बि	00	00	10
	409/1ए	00	07	45
	256/1बि	00	10	65
	256/1ए	00	13	35
	259/5बि	00	03	52
	289/ए (गवर्नमेंट ल्यान्ड)	00	00	25
	259/5ीस	00	14	75
	259/5डि	00	06	41
	291/3	00	11	86
	291/2	00	20	76
	290/3सि	00	04	50
	255/1	00	00	78
	290/3बि	00	16	48
	386/7सि	00	11	55
	370/6एफ	00	02	79
	311/1ए	00	18	33
	369 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	00	67
	357/2बि	00	34	68
	357/4	00	06	45
	357/5	00	00	10
	387	00	16	79
	368 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	37
	370/6इ	00	00	70
	398/3इ	00	15	00
	370/6जि	00	06	56
	384/1बि	00	26	41
	386/6सि	00	00	45
	398/3डि	00	23	36
	398/3सि	00	10	22
	255/3	00	18	53
	290/4	00	37	22
	290/5	00	05	98
	384/2	00	25	64
	386/6बि	00	00	10
	384/4सि	00	17	49
	384/4बि	00	10	87
3) पफलपूडि	51 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	07	33
	315/3सि	00	02	08
	315/3ए	00	14	24
	315/3बि	00	10	19
	56 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	06	81
	312/2	00	03	33
	318 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	02	02

1	2	3	4	5
3) पसलपूडि (निरंतर)	32 2 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	11	77
	315/2	00	05	48
	11/5	00	00	59
	317 (कासिंग ल्यान्ड)	00	04	14
	315/4	00	02	58
	20/1	00	04	34
	16/7	00	11	25
	11/8	00	13	58
	11/9	00	05	46
	17/3	00	06	84
	17/4	00	00	35
	17/5	00	11	42
	17/2	00	00	42
	17/10	00	00	14
	17/6	00	10	57
	17/7	00	08	76
	17/9	00	00	17
	17/8	00	04	17
	26/2	00	29	73
	53/17	00	21	66
	53/3बि	00	05	21
	53/16	00	02	06
	321/1	00	02	65
	316/2	00	28	60
	316/1	00	18	76
	308/8	00	04	16
	308/9	00	02	20
	308/7	00	17	82
	308/5	00	04	64
	308/6	00	01	67
	308/2	00	08	01
	308/3	00	03	33
	308/1	00	18	61
	23	00	07	51
	21/2	00	29	11
	8/2	00	34	60
	312/3	00	13	59
	312/5	00	00	10
	312/4	00	17	59
	309/6	00	02	58
	312/7	00	04	42
	312/8	00	12	04
	309/4	00	02	72

1	2	3	4	5
3) पसलपृष्ठि (निरंतर)	312/9	00	00	10
	11/3	00	00	67
	11/2	00	08	98
	11/1	00	09	58
	315/1	00	22	34
	24/4	00	14	55
	49/1	00	14	74
	312/1	00	00	33
	9/4	00	12	53
	9/1	00	01	18
	9/3	00	03	71
	9/2	00	00	41
	9/5	00	16	96
	24/3	00	17	65
	24/1	00	02	81
	24/2	00	12	60
	24/6	00	03	67
	24/7	00	00	10
	26/1	00	11	39
	12/4	00	09	94
	28/1	00	03	21
	11/6	00	14	87

[फा. सं. एल.-14014/9/03-जी.पी.]

स्वामी सिंह, निदेशक

New Delhi, 11th June, 2003

S. O. 1651.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the Natural Gas from the exploration blocks in the Northern/Southern offshore of Goa and structure in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter Company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to the various consumers of East Godavari and West Godavari Districts in the State of Andhra Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962(50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. P.V.RAMANA, Competent Authority, GTICL Pipeline Project, # 3-20-7/1, Rama Mohana Raja Nagar, KAKINADA - 533003, EAST GODAVARI Dist, ANDHRA PRADESH State, *namely,*

Schedule

Mandal : ALAMURU		District East Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh		
Village	Survey No./Sub-Division No.	Area of ROU			
		Hectare	Are	C-Are	
1	2	3	4	5	
1) BADUGUNIVANILANKA	61/6	00	09	15	
	61/9	00	15	57	
	59 (Crossing Land)	00	01	20	
	63/4	00	54	27	
	134 (Government Land)	01	44	79	
	40/4 (Government Land)	00	07	40	
	44/3	00	39	29	
	44/2	00	06	65	
	44/1	00	07	19	
	38/6	00	27	94	
	60 (Crossing Land)	00	29	90	
	133 (Government Land)	01	44	72	
	44/5	00	32	70	
	38/5	00	01	59	
	40/2	00	03	49	
	40/3	00	45	53	
	40/5	00	09	29	
	54/2	00	43	07	
	63/3	00	35	72	
	61/8	00	10	32	
	43/1	00	23	68	
2) GAWTAMI GODAVARI RIVER	River between village boundaries (Crossing Land)	03	81	81	
3) MADIKI	98/2	00	09	18	
	32	00	75	89	
	31/1	00	23	10	
	37/2	00	04	42	
	167/1	00	14	54	
	37/3	00	17	81	
	38/3	00	14	23	
	38/4	00	20	64	
	14/2	00	05	15	
	40/1	00	10	42	
	96/4	00	00	87	
	97/2	00	01	32	
	88 (Crossing Land)	00	07	33	
	15/1 (Government Land)	00	00	46	
	96/5	00	20	25	

1	2	3	4	5
3) MADIKI (Contd...)	31/2	00	02	84
	47/2	00	28	99
	47/3	00	10	06
	47/5	00	00	10
	47/4	00	18	09
	39/7A	00	02	17
	171/4A (Crossing Land)	00	07	48
	39/6	00	16	22
	95/4	00	19	31
	171/1B (Crossing Land)	00	05	72
	22 (Crossing Land)	00	07	01
	167/5 (Crossing Land)	00	02	79
	39/7B (Crossing Land)	00	03	71
	98/1 (Crossing Land)	00	08	03
	97/1	00	30	59
	172/2	00	26	33
	171/13B	00	03	04
	171/11B	00	07	30
	21/6	00	13	78
	172/5	00	13	07
	38/5	00	09	61
	16/4	00	14	95
	39/5	00	09	57
	171/14	00	10	88
	172/1	00	39	82
	170/1	00	14	53
	168/5	00	24	88
	168/4	00	17	82
	166/2	00	00	10
	167/4	00	17	84
	14/3	00	28	47
	95/3	00	12	23
	38/2	00	01	06
	95/2	00	28	37
	21/5	00	11	60
	21/4	00	00	10
	16/6	00	00	74
	16/5	00	31	51
	93/1	00	41	26
	89/1	00	01	17
	89/2	00	21	35
	89/3	00	20	40
	89/4	00	00	61

1	2	3	4	5
3) MADIKI (Contd....)	95/5	00	25	66
Mandal : ATREYA PURAM	District : East Godavari		State : Andhra Pradesh	
1) ATREYA PURAM	20/9	00	03	47
	20/7A	00	12	63
	20/6A	00	27	90
	18/5C	00	09	46
	18/4C	00	06	37
	20/5	00	04	97
	79/1	00	33	03
	20/6B (Crossing Land)	00	00	55
	29/2A (Crossing Land)	00	02	84
	29/1 (Crassing Land)	00	03	03
	28 (Crossing Land)	00	10	69
	18/1B (Crossing Land)	00	03	56
	18/7C	00	22	30
	16/1	00	01	71
	78 (Crossing Land)	00	06	61
	18/2A	00	05	64
	29/2B	00	04	22
	16/8	00	01	31
	29/4B	00	03	43
	29/3B	00	04	10
	18/6C	00	06	33
	18/10	00	00	10
	18/9	00	01	40
	18/8C	00	07	68
	20/6C	00	00	10
	79/2	00	19	57
	20/4	00	00	28
	18/2B (Government Land)	00	01	83
	16/7A, 16/7B (Government Land)	00	24	62
	16/6	00	10	91
	20/3	00	00	10
	77/1	00	07	46
	20/11	00	20	61
	18/8A	00	04	20
	77/2	00	01	76
	79/3	00	04.	28
	20/12	00	02	61
	20/10	00	03	62
2) VASANTAVADA	68/3	00	00	45
	72/18C	00	05	51

1	2	3	4	5
2) VASANTAVADA (Contd....)	72/19C	00	01	43
	72/20	00	14	60
	64/3 (Government Land)	00	34	51
	71/16	00	00	10
	71/1	00	19	42
	107/1	00	59	05
	71/7A (Government Land)	00	01	21
	72/16	00	00	40
	67/18	00	00	10
	70/5	00	28	02
	67/12	00	04	70
	71/2A	00	05	82
	70/6	00	00	10
	64/1	00	00	17
	67/17	00	10	40
	67/16	00	04	20
	67/15	00	09	15
	72/17C	00	03	20
	67/13	00	06	67
	70/4	00	07	34
	67/11	00	02	37
	67/10	00	01	16
	67/9	00	00	37
	67/19	00	12	42
	109/8	00	43	04
	68/2	00	05	01
	72/15A	00	00	10
	67/14	00	03	69
	72/4A (Crossing Land)	00	05	12
	65/1 (Crossing Land)	00	00	96
	68/1 (Crossing Land)	00	03	24
	117/1, 117/2 (Crossing Land)	00	04	54
	108	00	38	35
	69 (Crossing Land)	00	07	05
	72/18A	00	05	36
	72/17A	00	05	68
	72/19A	00	00	10
	64/2 (Crossing Land)	00	11	84
	65/2 (Crossing Land)	00	09	25
3) VASISTA GODAVARI RIVER	River between village boundaries (Crossing Land)	03	23	93
4) VUCHCHILI	55/4	00	04	13
	37/1	00	03	27

1	2	3	4	5
4) VUCHCHILI (Contd....)	37/4A	00	09	58
	40/2	00	07	73
	39/7	00	18	03
	55/2	00	00	10
	24 (Crossing Land)	00	06	57
	37/3	00	07	45
	38/1	00	19	95
	60 (Crossing Land)	00	03	44
	37/2B	00	17	19
	54 (Crossing Land)	00	33	58
	25/6	00	08	60
	40/1	00	03	88
	25/7	00	47	03
	61/3	00	23	53
	55/3B	00	00	38
	39/5	00	38	98
	55/3A	00	03	00
	41 (Crossing Land)	00	06	43

Mandal : KADIYAM	District : East Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) MURUMANDA	146	00	20	67
	246/9	00	08	53
	246/15	00	02	96
	247/3	00	19	61
	247/1	00	13	65
	247/2	00	10	12
	248/1	00	02	71
	144/2	00	08	58
	390/4	00	00	12
	65/3	00	07	66
	390/8	00	07	03
	246/6	00	07	78
	390/5	00	04	89
	247/4	00	06	12
	150/2	00	20	34
	151/2	00	10	69
	392/3	00	23	40
	390/6	00	12	32
	145/4	00	01	63
	89/4	00	08	23
	143/2	00	00	17
	144/3	00	07	77
	144/1	00	00	10
	151/3	00	11	70

1	2	3	4	5
1) MURUMANDA (Contd....)				
	150/1	00	08	13
	145/6	00	09	67
	151/4	00	10	41
	154/1	00	41	36
	154/2	00	03	60
	41/4	00	01	53
	41/3	00	00	10
	143/1	00	04	52
	145/5	00	09	46
	144/4	00	20	72
	363/2	00	03	47
	246/7	00	08	32
	374	00	00	82
	363/4	00	33	31
	271/2	00	23	72
	390/9	00	13	43
	402/2	00	28	55
	364	00	31	52
	69/2	00	30	01
	365	00	36	17
	392/1	00	14	19
	390/3	00	14	45
	345/2	00	33	78
	344/1	00	21	90
	269/3	00	00	75
	392/2	00	09	93
	402/1	00	18	35
	367	00	25	41
	270/2	00	00	10
	275	00	00	10
	274/2	00	16	95
	271/3	00	00	50
	348/1	00	00	48
	271/1	00	02	94
	363/1	00	04	41
	368	00	15	59
	389/4	00	13	51
	369/2	00	02	79
	369/1	00	11	91
	369/3	00	06	55
	369/4	00	05	98
	369/6	00	01	24
	370/1	00	21	99

1	2	3	4	5
1) MURUMANDA (Contd....)				
	246/5	00	08	62
	261/2	00	47	93
	348/2	00	25	40
	389/7	00	07	63
	389/1	00	10	55
	389/10	00	00	10
	389/8	00	31	46
	269/2	00	14	39
	389/3	00	12	48
	262	00	45	60
	90/1	00	00	12
	260	00	00	10
	390/2	00	14	12
	272/1	00	27	35
	270/1	00	16	16
	363/5	00	04	29
	390/7	00	00	73
	269/1	00	15	50
	85/2	00	05	47
	246/4	00	00	10
	89/5	00	11	30
	88/1	00	00	10
	87	00	34	30
	84	00	09	51
	85/5	00	09	63
	389/2	00	01	55
	85/6	00	14	94
	388/5	00	02	68
	83/2	00	09	12
	83/1	00	14	71
	61/3	00	09	53
	65/4	00	41	27
	89/2	00	20	65
	65/2	00	00	50
	85/4	00	02	14
	153 (Crossing Land)	00	03	86
	62 (Crossing Land)	00	04	49
	43 (Crossing Land)	00	05	04
	139 (Crossing Land)	00	04	26
	342 (Crossing Land)	00	04	13
	142 (Crossing Land)	00	05	77

Mandal : MANDAPETA

District : East Godavari

State : Andhra Pradesh

1) EDIDA

94/1

00

04

77

1	2	3	4	5
1) EDIDA (Contd....)				
	41/2	00	00	10
	41/3	00	14	40
	45/1	00	03	57
	81/3	00	04	54
	76/1	00	09	10
	81/4	00	10	87
	103/2	00	19	45
	44/1	00	31	50
	94/2	00	21	51
	40/2	00	22	61
	94/3	00	18	29
	94/4	00	09	30
	98/3	00	18	80
	95/1	00	01	53
	38/1	00	13	53
	96/3A	00	09	66
	97/7	00	00	10
	96/2	00	21	51
	96/1	00	00	51
	81/2	00	19	67
	36/2B	00	05	13
	105 (Crossing Land)	00	11	50
	39	00	21	42
	43 (Crossing Land)	00	00	75
	37 (Crossing Land)	00	05	67
	40/1	00	03	03
	42 (Crossing Land)	00	09	08
	82 (Crossing Land)	00	09	08
	101 (Crossing Land)	00	20	14

Mandal : PERAVALI	District : West Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) KANURU (AGRAHARAM)				
	34 (Crossing Land)	00	05	48
	7/3A2 (Crossing Land)	00	01	68
	7/3B (Crossing Land)	00	00	10
	7/1	00	12	02
	7/2	00	10	07
	8/2C	00	01	21
	8/2D	00	39	54
	5	00	00	29
	8/2B (Crossing Land)	00	03	64
	7/3A1	00	07	30
	Between Village Boundary and Survey No 34 (Government Land)	00	08	55

1	2	3	4	5-
1) KANURU (AGRAHARAM) (Contd....)	Between Village Boundary and Survey No 5 (Government Land)	03	25	69
2) KANURU (ZAMINDARI)				
187/6	00	09	69	
187/8C	00	07	23	
187/3	00	03	59	
187/4	00	05	52	
187/8B	00	00	31	
196/4	00	06	35	
187/7	00	08	30	
186/9D	00	00	35	
187/5	00	06	88	
173	00	00	30	
353	00	25	72	
196/3	00	06	68	
197/3	00	23	65	
197/6	00	16	50	
169/15	00	09	20	
31 (Crossing Land)	00	08	76	
207/8	00	00	79	
354	01	78	35	
32/7 (Crossing Land)	00	07	00	
187/10	00	00	38	
32/2	00	01	22	
33/2	00	03	82	
174/4	00	25	36	
207/3	00	13	86	
207/2B	00	13	13	
207/2A	00	02	16	
169/5	00	07	83	
174/3	00	02	11	
169/3	00	01	08	
34 (Crossing Land)	00	04	49	
169/2	00	10	03	
169/1	00	07	77	
171/3	00	00	28	
170/1	00	28	69	
175/7	00	23	21	
207/7	00	03	80	
169/4	00	05	09	
204/1	00	17	83	
169/6	00	27	15	
207/9B	00	09	01	
207/1	00	00	78	

1	2	3	4	5
2) KANURU (ZAMINDARI) (Contd....)	196/1	00	04	43
	196/5A, 196/5B, 196/5C, 196/5D	00	15	30
	204/3B	00	15	89
	207/9A	00	07	50
	204/2	00	14	52
	169/14	00	02	32
	206/3	00	14	70
	206/2	00	13	65
	206/1B	00	04	54
	206/4	00	11	01
	188 (Crossing Land)	00	08	91
	207/6	00	03	49
	204/3A	00	10	67
	187/9	00	24	57
	33/5	00	05	93
	360	00	19	48
	33/6	00	01	34
	30/2	00	08	21
	32/1	00	07	58
	33/7	00	00	10
	33/4	00	22	86
	196/2	00	04	66
	355	00	52	53
	33/3	00	02	10
3) NADUPALLE	14/1	00	12	48
	44/8	00	00	23
	154/5	00	01	50
	53/1B	00	01	79
	149/6	00	00	76
	14/4	00	01	63
	29/10A	00	08	13
	29/9	00	03	79
	29/10B	00	07	90
	53/1A	00	09	70
	15/22	00	23	76
	45/2	00	14	90
	154/4	00	06	58
	43/3A, 43/3B	00	18	23
	54/5	00	00	10
	43/4	00	12	43
	49/8	00	06	60
	43/5	00	19	04
	43/6	00	04	95

1	2	3	4	5
3) NADUPALLE (Contd....)	49/7	00	05	86
	40/11	00	00	40
	41/5	00	09	41
	45/1	00	10	50
	72/4	00	12	32
	54/4	00	12	95
	154/3	00	18	18
	75/1	00	02	36
	75/2	00	13	36
	16/8A	00	12	81
	73/7	00	09	54
	154/7	00	05	92
	73/5	00	13	80
	16/6	00	16	85
	154/6	00	03	87
	72/7B	00	00	42
	73/8	00	14	67
	72/5	00	10	03
	15/18B	00	16	31
	72/2	00	06	24
	77/1	00	13	10
	74/6	00	22	85
	17/6	00	00	10
	73/4	00	03	01
	77/3	00	00	10
	154/10A	00	01	93
	14/2	00	12	98
	15/18A	00	05	78
	50/2B	00	00	21
	54/1C	00	15	36
	72/7A	00	03	16
	15/21	00	07	76
	50/3	00	14	83
	54/2	00	08	46
	149/4	00	00	10
	149/1	00	07	70
	149/2	00	08	53
	29/11	00	10	02
	47 (Crossing Land)	00	25	34
	150/2	00	07	61
	89 (Crossing Land)	00	09	13
	42/4	00	01	30
	43/8	00	09	63

1	2	3	4	5
3) NADUPALLE (Contd....)				
	50/4	00	25	69
	41/4	00	17	66
	149/5	00	10	78
	16/5	00	01	16
	54/1B	00	00	54
	54/1A	00	06	78
	150/1F	00	14	43
	41/2	00	08	77
	72/3	00	11	58
	149/3	00	10	40
	154/8	00	09	26
	42/5	00	12	42
	150/6	00	11	46
	150/7	00	17	23
	150/1E	00	00	33
	16/8B	00	12	18
	97	00	29	50
	52 (Crossing Land)	00	19	56
	151	00	25	66
	153/6	00	17	66
	11 (Crossing Land)	00	07	01
	74/5	00	09	97
	153/5B	00	06	90
	43/7	00	14	46
	155/9	00	00	10
	154/2	00	02	59
	41/6	00	12	74
	43/9	00	11	05
	41/3	00	05	86
	16/7	00	25	04
	72/1 (Crossing Land)	00	01	48

Mandal : TADEPALLIGUDEM	District : West Godavari	State : Andhra Pradesh		
1) ARUGOLAM	510/6	00	00	10
	504	00	05	64
	733/2	00	24	19
	575/2	00	36	51
	690/2	00	00	10
	630/9	00	06	24
	687/4C	00	02	34
	522/6	00	08	36
	683/2	00	06	23
	694/1A	00	03	20
	694/2A	00	23	97

1	2	3	4	5
1) ARUGOLANU (Contd....)	694/2B	00	15	62
	523/3B	00	27	18
	630/5	00	07	24
	523/3F	00	00	39
	522/3	00	16	32
	522/4	00	14	41
	629/3A, 629/3B	00	02	91
	802/2	00	04	15
	635/7	00	37	05
	681/4	00	03	89
	681/3	00	07	35
	681/2	00	18	03
	681/1	00	10	32
	636/4B	00	03	91
	636/4A	00	00	48
	733/1	00	11	26
	687/4D	00	05	64
	522/2	00	38	28
	579/4 (Crossing Land)	00	21	60
	736/1A	00	00	22
	802/3	00	08	30
	629/2A	00	03	36
	630/4	00	03	20
	683/1	00	09	42
	686 (Crossing Land)	00	02	70
	694/1B	00	02	80
	522/5 (Crossing Land)	00	02	88
	598/2	00	07	06
	603 (Crossing Land)	00	23	24
	629/4D	00	07	73
	606 (Crossing Land)	00	03	93
	576 (Crossing Land)	00	55	65
	691/1 (Crossing Land)	00	11	11
	698 (Crossing Land)	00	10	35
	574 (Crossing Land)	00	03	54
	602 (Crossing Land)	00	12	27
	597 (Crossing Land)	00	05	36
	371 (Crossing Land)	00	07	08
	627/1 (Crossing Land)	00	22	22
	630/7	00	00	12
	693/1	00	12	27
	689/2	00	04	36
	689/1A,689/1B	00	06	84

1	2	3	4	5
1) ARUGOLANU (Contd....)	694/2C	00	09	96
	635/6	00	18	32
	631	00	33	83
	632/4	00	01	98
	632/3	00	05	24
	598/1	00	89	80
	503	00	28	86
	693/2A	00	11	03
	802/1	00	07	14
	630/10	00	16	52
	630/12	00	02	00
	630/11	00	06	07
	629/5B	00	03	08
	629/5A	00	02	38
	629/4B	00	01	29
	629/4C	00	03	06
	632/2D	00	04	35
	692/1B	00	05	68
	359/10	00	10	94
	600	00	30	00
	370/4	00	10	09
	370/3C	00	15	18
	629/1	00	01	26
	690/5	00	05	34
	370/2	00	07	42
	692/1A	00	07	22
	370/3B	00	06	83
	370/3A	00	04	61
	369/1C	00	01	56
	601/1A	00	05	60
	372/1	00	12	20
	369/1B	00	02	72
	369/2A	00	16	06
	601/1B	00	00	93
	367/2A	00	43	50
	369/1A	00	00	80
	367/2B	00	18	36
	629/2B	00	03	64
	368/4	00	18	24
	525/1	00	63	47
	368/3	00	17	80
	369/2B	00	19	92
	526/4D	00	01	05

1	2	3	4	5
1) ARUGOLANU (Contd....)				
	523/1	00	13	54
	601/2A	00	02	07
	372/2	00	11	29
	690/3B	00	02	08
	523/3A	00	17	52
	523/2	00	01	44
	601/1F	00	08	84
	367/3	00	03	24
	601/1E	00	03	98
	601/1C	00	04	73
	795	00	44	46
	595/2	00	02	70
	596	00	29	95
2) ARULLA (AGRAHARAM)	10/3F	00	00	67
	203/3	00	00	93
	189 (Crossing Land)	00	02	28
	203 5	00	22	93
	182	00	11	72
	252 (Crossing Land)	00	08	75
	181 A, 181/7B	00	22	84
	18	00	01	27
	264/2	00	22	32
	180/5	00	36	10
	179	00	11	77
	273 (Crossing Land)	00	15	31
	178/1	00	01	21
	208/2	00	24	04
	264/3	00	11	23
	206/10	00	09	71
	265/13	00	26	17
	206/9	00	08	99
	206/7	00	17	32
	265/12	00	06	61
	205	00	41	28
	175 (Crossing Land)	00	20	85
	183 (Crossing Land)	00	05	14
	208/3	00	10	28
	185/3B	00	00	10
	92 (Crossing Land)	00	07	69
	265/8A	00	00	19
	188 (Crossing Land)	00	01	60
	263/7	00	15	62
	262/1	00	02	44

1	2	3	4	5
2) ARULLA (AGRAHARAM) (Contd....)	262/2	00	02	04
	204/2	00	02	95
	295/3	00	15	83
	295/1A,295/1B, 295/1C	00	14	51
	87 (Crossing Land)	00	13	42
	265/5	00	01	74
	137 (Crossing Land)	00	25	09
	136 (Crossing Land)	00	03	11
	203/4	00	23	78
	264/4	00	00	13
	13/4A,13/4B,13/4C	00	17	29
	13/3	00	00	46
	204/1 (Crossing Land)	00	02	73
	144/2	00	11	09
	145/2A, 145/2B	00	05	86
	14/4	00	32	55
	91/1	00	23	55
	204/4 (Government Land)	00	02	50
	90/9A, 90/9B	00	00	85
	251/4	00	15	20
	11/1	00	22	17
	251/7	00	00	31
	14/2	00	15	65
	15	00	12	92
	265/4	00	04	21
	13/1A, 13/1B	00	17	22
	265/7	00	09	23
	10/3E	00	06	24
	12/1	00	12	80
	13/2	00	04	64
	10/4	00	10	33
	145/1	00	04	43
	265/6	00	02	60
	185/3A	00	42	01
	91/2	00	00	45
	140/1	00	23	73
	201/1	00	01	34
	144/3	00	07	16
	144/1	00	05	01
	145/3	00	10	43
	251/2	00	05	11
	141/1	00	16	79
	295/2 (Government Land)	00	27	40

1	2	3	4	5
2) ARULLA (AGRAHARAM) (Contd....)	141/2	00	29	77
	142	00	10	00
	143/2	00	55	36
	172	00	31	05
	262/3	00	39	22
	251/6	00	13	51
	251/5	00	08	32
	204/3 (Crossing Land)	00	01	86
	173	00	55	79
3) JAGANNADHA PURAM	589/3	00	13	92
	595/3	00	00	91
	594/1	00	04	41
	595/5B	00	11	82
	592/3	00	16	32
	592/1A, 592/1B,592/1C	00	12	57
	593/1A	00	02	41
	590/2B	00	14	56
	590/2C	00	00	33
	594/3	00	00	61
	595/4	00	00	10
	609 (Crossing Land)	00	02	59
	597/1	00	11	31
	590/1	00	12	41
	590/2A	00	01	92
	595/1B	00	07	59
	595/2	00	09	54
	595/5A	00	00	84
	598/5B	00	02	07
	588	00	15	29
	589/1	00	10	94
	589/2	00	10	56
	596/1	00	09	26
	597/2	00	10	52
4) KADAKATLA	32 (Government Land)	00	21	31
	33 (Government Land)	00	52	38
	59/2 (Crossing Land)	00	04	14
	269 (Crossing Land)	00	09	16
	122 (Crossing Land)	00	05	79
	76 (Crossing Land)	00	51	07
	75 (Crossing Land)	00	32	59
	67/1	00	17	75
	60 (Crossing Land)	00	04	29
	61/1	00	47	44

1	2	3	4	5
4) KADAKATLA (Contd....)	271/1A, 271/1B	00	12	29
	21/3	00	06	10
	62/2	00	06	92
	21/1	00	37	53
	68/1	00	05	34
	59/1	00	53	98
	67/2	00	11	90
	58/1, 58/2	00	00	94
	27/2	00	33	46
	26/4	00	00	62
	26/1	00	19	11
	25/2C	00	11	00
	25/2B	00	54	51
	25/2A	00	13	61
	25/1	00	06	00
	62/4A, 62/4B	00	06	99
	67/3	00	11	27
	29/2	00	81	48
	21/2	00	11	30
	270	00	39	76
	66/3A, 66/3B	00	30	33
	66/2C	00	04	80
	120	00	48	73
	62/6A, 62/6B	00	33	39
	121	00	06	48
	271/2	00	13	19
	271/3	00	06	49
	271/4A, 271/4B, 271/4C	00	00	50
	20/1, 20/2, 20/3	00	04	76
	62/1	00	05	86
5) KONDRUPROLU	370 (Government Land)	00	86	74
	429 (Crossing Land)	00	02	89
	417/1	00	33	66
	335/3	00	31	18
	334	00	70	49
	428/1	00	02	60
	416 (Crossing Land)	00	03	16
	423/2	00	10	81
	417/3	00	00	10
	418	00	08	44
	333 (Crossing Land)	00	00	76
	427 (Government Land)	00	26	09
	426 (Crossing Land)	00	32	64

1	2	3	4	5
5) KONDUPROLU (Contd....)	335/2 417/7 335/1 (Crossing Land) 369 (Government Land)	00 00 00 00	09 46 00 13	31 47 38 77
6) KUNCHANAPALLI	232/1 287/1 (Government Land) 254 (Crossing Land) 253/1 238/2 238/3 238/4 239/5 239/7 223/2 252/1 223/1 252/2 285/1 253/3 285/2 (Government Land) 219 287/2 276/2 276/1 277/5 218 217 216 215 214/3 214/2 234	00 00	00 01 04 13 02 29 14 12 27 24 22 01 26 74 02 22 54 26 22 03 22 11 34 38 04 15 18	15 85 07 85 58 48 17 71 29 62 74 31 13 09 70 20 70 41 63 85 85 36 74 07 46 28 09 42
7) NAVABUPALEM	3/1 2 (Crossing Land) 5/2B 1 (Crossing Land) 5/3F 5/2A 5/3C 5/3A 3/2 5/6B 5/5	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	03 03 11 16 02 07 04 02 00 11 11	52 62 08 37 69 80 37 65 33 80 13

1	2	3	4	5
7) NAVABUPALEM (Contd....)				
	5/7	00	00	10
	5/6A	00	12	34
	5/1	00	00	95
	5/4	00	08	69
	5/3G	00	05	03
8) TADEPALLE	1119/1C	00	00	53
	1116 (Crossing Land)	00	14	03
	988/3	00	14	59
	1119/1B	00	05	35
	1111/1	00	25	17
	1132/3E	00	09	66
	1121/2B	00	00	10
	1132/3D	00	03	42
	1036	00	53	71
	1035/3A	00	11	57
	1111/2	00	08	99
	1114/3	00	25	17
	1121/1B	00	01	65
	1120/2B	00	07	51
	1035/3B	00	05	97
	1113/2C	00	09	23
	1121/2E	00	11	27
	1120/2C	00	02	55
	1120/1	00	26	35
	1106/1A	00	03	51
	1120/2A	00	08	02
	1113/2B	00	00	35
	1132/3G	00	03	64
	1114/2	00	03	02
	1133/2 (Crossing Land)	00	17	04
	1058/3 (Crossing Land)	00	06	42
	1118 (Crossing Land)	00	01	69
	1119/1A	00	09	29
	1033 (Crossing Land)	00	08	55
	1120/2E	00	09	40
	1134/1	00	06	89
	1133/1	00	16	80
	988/2	00	06	78
	1132/3H	00	06	58
	1035/2A	00	03	60
	1132/3F	00	00	16
	1120/2D	00	00	10
	987	00	66	90

1	2	3	4	5
9) TADEPALI F (Contd . .)	1115/2	00	13	66
	988/1	00	07	37
	1061/1	00	03	33
	989/6	00	00	10
	1035/2C	00	13	43
	1035/2B	00	10	59
	1132/3I	00	02	47
	1029/2	00	00	10
	1035/1	00	08	20
	1035/4A	00	07	80
	1030/5A	00	04	00
	1030/4A	00	06	74
	1030/4B	00	11	43
	1030/4C	00	03	28
	1030/5B	00	00	28
	1030/2	00	05	98
	1029/4	00	14	19
	1029/3	00	14	96
	1029/8	00	09	00
	1029/9	00	41	36
	978/1, 978/2, 978/3, 978/4	00	11	89
	1115/1	00	21	66
	1035/4C	00	01	63
	1030/1	00	24	69
9) TADEPALI GUDEM	6/1	00	20	33
	162/2	00	11	22
	6/2	00	20	33

Mandal :	UNDRAJA VARAM	District :	West Godavari	State :	Andhra Pradesh
1) UAMM NHU	2/1		00	07	14
	1 (Crossing Land)		00	07	79
	2/2A		00	01	74
2) KALDHARI	259/7A		00	02	13
	259/8A		00	02	53
	259/3		00	12	40
	292/3C		00	10	26
	275/3		00	29	83
	275/1		00	09	35
	275/2		00	08	56
	274/2A		00	07	33
	274/1A		00	07	72
	259/2B		00	20	05
	274/1B		00	05	51

1	2	3	4	5
2) KALDHARI (Contd....)	229/21	00	06	78
	272/7	00	00	78
	396 (Crossing Land)	00	02	74
	401 (Crossing Land)	00	21	44
	293 (Crossing Land)	00	15	38
	257 (Crossing Land)	00	03	86
	309 (Crossing Land)	00	12	73
	353 (Crossing Land)	00	05	59
	310 (Crossing Land)	00	07	45
	352/2 (Crossing Land)	00	00	86
	254/3E	00	05	66
	259/5A	00	17	46
	352/1B	00	28	66
	229/10	00	02	37
	254/5	00	11	93
	254/2	00	09	86
	254/1	00	17	77
	229/22	00	06	62
	229/11	00	08	33
	229/9	00	00	10
	272/6	00	21	88
	254/6	00	05	66
	357/2A	00	00	19
	274/1C	00	08	87
	350/4	00	01	94
	385 (Crossing Land)	00	04	73
	351/5	00	26	76
	351/7	00	22	38
	351/4A	00	00	10
	342/3	00	21	21
	342/2B	00	12	27
	342/1B	00	02	65
	342/1A	00	00	10
	292/4	00	15	96
	254/4	00	01	31
	273/1	00	00	10
	356	00	36	35
	255/2	00	15	31
	410/1	00	34	25
	311/2A	00	06	45
	399/3	00	84	44
	352/1A (Crossing Land)	00	23	51
	399/2	00	00	10

1	2	3	4	5
2) KALDHARI (Contd..)	400/1B	00	00	19
	400/1A	00	17	53
	400/2A	00	02	07
	386/7B	00	18	16
	259/6A	00	01	97
	410/2A	00	03	06
	311/1B	00	00	10
	409/1A	00	07	45
	256/1B	00	10	65
	256/1A	00	13	35
	259/5B	00	03	52
	289/A (Government Land)	00	00	25
	259/5C	00	14	75
	259/5D	00	06	41
	291/3	00	11	86
	291/2	00	20	76
	290/3C	00	04	50
	255/1	00	00	78
	290/3B	00	16	48
	386/7C	00	11	55
	370/6F	00	02	79
	311/1A	00	18	33
	369 (Crossing Land)	00	00	67
	357/2B	00	34	68
	357/4	00	06	45
	357/5	00	00	10
	387	00	16	79
	368 (Crossing Land)	00	07	37
	370/6E	00	00	70
	398/3E	00	15	00
	370/6G	00	06	56
	384/1B	00	26	41
	386/6C	00	00	45
	398/3D	00	23	36
	398/3C	00	10	22
	255/3	00	18	53
	290/4	00	37	22
	290/5	00	05	98
	384/2	00	25	64
	386/6B	00	00	10
	384/4C	00	17	49
	384/4B	00	10	87
3) PASALAPUDI	51 (Crossing Land)	00	07	33

1	2	3	4	5
3) PASALAPUDI (Contd....)	315/3C	00	02	08
	315/3A	00	14	24
	315/3B	00	10	19
	56 (Crossing Land)	00	06	81
	312/2	00	03	33
	318 (Crossing Land)	00	02	02
	322 (Crossing Land)	00	11	77
	315/2	00	05	48
	11/5	00	00	59
	317 (Crossing Land)	00	04	14
	315/4	00	02	58
	20/1	00	04	34
	16/7	00	11	25
	11/8	00	13	58
	11/9	00	05	46
	17/3	00	06	84
	17/4	00	00	35
	17/5	00	11	42
	17/2	00	00	42
	17/10	00	00	14
	17/6	00	10	57
	17/7	00	08	76
	17/9	00	00	17
	17/8	00	04	17
	26/2	00	29	73
	53/17	00	21	66
	53/3B	00	05	21
	53/16	00	02	06
	321/1	00	02	65
	316/2	00	28	60
	316/1	00	18	76
	308/8	00	04	16
	308/9	00	02	20
	308/7	00	17	82
	308/5	00	04	64
	308/6	00	01	67
	308/2	00	08	01
	308/3	00	03	33
	308/1	00	18	61
	23	00	07	51
	21/2	00	29	11
	8/2	00	34	60
	312/3	00	13	59

1	2	3	4	5
3) PASALAPUDI (Contd....)	312/5	00	00	10
	312/4	00	17	59
	309/6	00	02	58
	312/7	00	04	42
	312/8	00	12	04
	309/4	00	02	72
	312/9	00	00	10
	11/3	00	00	67
	11/2	00	08	98
	11/1	00	09	58
	315/1	00	22	34
	24/4	00	14	55
	49/1	00	14	74
	312/1	00	00	33
	9/4	00	12	53
	9/1	00	01	18
	9/3	00	03	71
	9/2	00	00	41
	9/5	00	16	96
	24/3	00	17	65
	24/1	00	02	81
	24/2	00	12	60
	24/6	00	03	67
	24/7	00	00	10
	26/1	00	11	39
	12/4	00	09	94
	28/1	00	03	21
	11/6	00	14	87

[No. L-14014/9/03-G.P.]
SWAMY SINGH, Director

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 14 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1652.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय राजस्थान एटोमिक पावर स्टेशन प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जयपुर (संदर्भ संख्या सी. जी. आई टी. 02/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/136/2002-आई.आर (सी-II)]
एन० पी० केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 14th May, 2003

S.O. 1652.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-02/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Rajasthan Atomic Power Station and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-5-2003.

[No. L-42012/136/2002-IR(C-II)]
N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
CUM LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR
Case No. CGIT-02/2003

REFERENCE NO. L-42012/136/2002 IR (CM-II)

The General Secretary,
R.A.P.K. Sangh (INTUC),
INTUC Office Pratap Circle,
P.O. Rawatbhata via Kota,
Kota (Rajasthan)

.....Applicant Union

Versus

The Station Director,
Rajasthan Atomic Power Station 1 & 2,
P.O. Rawatbhata Via Kota,
Kota (Rajasthan).

.....Non-applicant

Present :

Presiding Officer : Sh. R.C. Sharma

For the applicant : None.

For the non-applicant : Sh. Manish Bhandari.

Date of award : 21-04-2003

AWARD

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers referred under clause D of Sub-section 1 & Sub-section 2(a) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short, the Act) has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, which runs as under :—

“ Whether the act of the management in giving notice under Section 19(2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and in terminating clause C(C) under Demand No. 3 of Memorandum of Settlement dated 8-12-1972 is legal and justified? If yes, whether the employees are entitled to one day's extra wages in lieu of working on 2nd Saturday?”

2. After the service of the notice on both the parties on 17-2-2003, the representative Sh. R.A. Sharma put his appearance on behalf of the General Secretary, Applicant-Union, but thereafter none appeared on behalf of the Union. The case was fixed for filing the statement of claim on 17-3-2003 and 17-4-2003 respectively, but even the statement of claim could not be submitted on behalf of the Applicant-Union. It appears that the Applicant-Union is not willing to further contest the dispute.

3. Accordingly, a “No Dispute Award” is passed in this matter.

4. A copy of the award may be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1653.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिचर्डसन एण्ड क्रुडास लिमिटेड प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण मुम्बई नं. II (संदर्भ संख्या सी. जी. आई टी. 2/131 का 2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/47/2001-आई.आर (सी-II)]
एन० पी० केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th May, 2003

S.O.1653.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/131 of 2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Mumbai No. II as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Richardson & Crudas Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-5-2003.

[No. L-42012/47/2001-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II, MUMBAI

PRESENT:

S.N. SAUNDANKAR,
Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/131 of 2001.**EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF**

M/s. Richardson & Cruddas Ltd., (1972)
Byculla Iron Works, Byculla

The General Manager (IR),
M/s. Richardson & Cruddas Ltd., (1972)
Byculla Iron Works, Byculla,
MUMBAI-400008.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

The President,
Association of Engineering Workers,
252, Janta Colony, Ramnarayan Narker Marg,
Ghatkopar (East),
MUMBAI-400077.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employer	: Mr. S.Z. Chowdhary, Advocate.
For the Workmen	: Mr. Abhay Kulkarni, Advocate.

Mumbai, dated 31st March, 2003.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by its Order No-L-42012/47/2001/IR(CM-II) dt'd. 28/11/2001, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd., Mumbai in terminating the services of Sh. S.T. Pathak, Helper w.e.f. 31/8/1997 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief he is entitled to?"

2. Workman Pathak, Helper was terminating by the company on 31/8/1997. According to workman he was illegally terminated, Management denied the same contending that workman was terminated on holding departmental inquiry wherein the inquiry officer found the workman behaved indecently with the co-workers, amounting to misconduct. On the basis of the pleadings issues were framed at Exhibit-11 and when the matter was fixed for evidence, both the parties by joint purshis (Exhibit-13) pointed out that they have settled the dispute amicably and consequently reference be disposed of. Since reference is settled the following order is passed :—

ORDER

Reference stands disposed of vide settlement (Exhibit-13).

**S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer
EX. NO. 13**

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, MUMBAI**

REFERENCE NO. 131 of 2001**BETWEEN**

**M/S. RICHARDSON & CRUDDAS (1972) LTD.
AND**

THEIR WORKMEN

MAY IT PLEASE THIS HON'BLE COURT :—

The above reference has been settled between the parties on following terms :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- (a) The workman shall be reinstated in the employment of the Company with continuity of service on and from 31/3/2003 & shall be paid an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) towards back wages for the period of suspension and/or unemployment on account of termination of services.
- (b) The agreed amount payable to the workman under the settlement is Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) shall be paid to the workman subject to various statutory deductions.
- (c) The said amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (One Lac Only) shall include suspension allowance, back wages, bonus, leave wages & various other allowances etc. which the workman would have earned had he not been suspended and/or terminated.
- (d) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall not make any claim of whatsoever nature against the Company in future including any claim in relation to the period of unemployment on account of suspension and/or termination of his services forming subject matter of the above reference except what is agreed hereinabove.
- (e) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall submit his resignation before the end of working hours of 21/3/2003 under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme declared by the Company.
- (f) The Company agrees and undertakes to accept the resignation of the workman under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme and

relieve him from the end of working hours of 31-3-2003.

- (g) The Company agrees and undertakes to pay to the workman the amounts payable under this settlement and the Voluntary Retirement Scheme at the time of payment of terminal dues to the other workmen retiring under the said Voluntary Retirement Scheme.
- (h) In view of aforesaid terms and conditions, the parties to the reference shall pray the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 to dispose of the said reference in terms of this settlement."

The parties to this reference, therefore, jointly pray that the above reference may please be disposed of in terms of this settlement.

Dated : 31-03-2003

For Richardson & Cruddas
(1972) Ltd.

Advocate for the Company.

G. B. MISHRA,
General Manager

Advocate for the workman.

Workman

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1654.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिचर्ड्सन एंड क्रुडास लिमिटेड 1972 के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. II मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी. जी. आई.टी. 2/196/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/156/99-आई.आर (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय चर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th May, 2003

S.O.1656.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/196/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Labour Court, No. II Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Richardson & Cruddas Ltd. 1972, Mumbai and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-5-2003.

[No. L-42012/156/99-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II, MUMBAI

PRESENT

S.N. SAUNDANKAR
PRESIDING OFFICER

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/196 of 1999.

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF

The Genl. Manager (IR),
M/s. Richardson & Cruddas Ltd.,

The Managing Director,
M/s. Richardson & Cruddas Ltd.,
(1972), Mulund Works, LBS MARG,
Mulund, MUMBAI-400080.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

The President,
Association of Engineering Workers,
252, Janta Colony, Ramnarayan Narker Marg,
Ghatkopar (East),
MUMBAI-400077.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employer : Mr. S. Z. Chowdhary,
Advocate.

For the Workmen : V. T. Mirajkar,
Advocate.

Mumbai, dated 31st March, 2003.

AWARD—PART-II

By the Interim Award dtd. 19th February 2003 this Tribunal held that the domestic inquiry conducted against the workman Nirbhawane was as per the Principles of Natural Justice and findings recorded by the inquiry officer are not perverse. Consequently point remains as to whether the punishment of termination of service imposed on workman by the management is legal and justified. Matter was therefore kept for leading evidence by both the sides.

2. Parties concerned i.e. workman and the management vide settlement (Exhibit-22) pointed out that they have settled the dispute amicably and therefore the reference be disposed of in terms of settlement. Hence the order :—

ORDER

Reference stands disposed of as settled vide purshis (Exhibit-22).

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

EX. NO. 22

BEFORE THE HON'BLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 AT MUMBAI

REFERENCE NO. 196 of 1999.

BETWEEN

M/S. RICHARDSON & CRUDDAS (1972) LTD.

AND
THEIR WORKMEN
MAY IT PLEASE THIS HON'BLE COURT:—

The above reference has been settled between the parties on following terms :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- (a) The workman shall be reinstated in the employment of the Company with continuity of service on and from 31-3-2003 & shall be paid an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) towards back wages for the period of suspension and/or unemployment on account of termination of services.
- (b) The agreed amount payable to the workman under the settlement is Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) shall be paid to the workman subject to various statutory deductions.
- (c) The said amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (One Lacs Only) shall include suspension allowance, back wages, bonus, leave wages & various other allowances etc. which the workman would have earned had he not been suspended and/or terminated.
- (d) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall not make any claim of whatsoever nature against the Company in future including any claim in relation to the period of unemployment on account of suspension and/or termination of his services forming subject matter of the above reference except what is agreed herein above.
- (e) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall submit his resignation before the end of working hours of 21-3-2003 under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme declared by the Company.
- (f) The Company agrees and undertakes of accept the resignation of the workman under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme and relieve him from the end of working hours of 31-3-2003.
- (g) The Company agrees and undertakes to pay to the workman the amounts payable under this settlement and the Voluntary Retirement Scheme at the time of payment of terminal dues to the other workmen retiring under the said Voluntary Retirement Scheme.
- (h) In view of aforesaid terms and conditions, the parties to the reference shall pray the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 to dispose of the said reference in terms of this settlement.”

The parties to this reference, therefore, jointly pray that the above reference may please be disposed of in terms of this settlement.

For Richardson & Cruddas
(1972) Ltd.

Sd./-

Advocate for the Company.	General Manager
Advocate for the workman.	Workman
V.T. Mirajkar	

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1655.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिचर्डसन एंड क्रुडास लिमिटेड, 1972 के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकारण नं. 2 मुख्यमंडल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी. जी. आई टी. 2/66/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/228/98-आई.आर (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय बर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th May, 2003

S.O.1655.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/66/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. II, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd., Mumbai and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-5-2003.

[No. L-42012/228/98-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II, MUMBAI

PRESENT

S.N. SAUNDANKAR
PRESIDING OFFICER

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/66 of 1999.

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO
THE MANAGEMENT OF

THE GENERAL MANAGER (P&A),
M/S. RICHARDSON & CRUDDAS

The General Manager (P&A),
M/s. Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd.,
Mulund Works, LBS Marg,
Mulund, (West), Mumbai-400080.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

The President,
Association of Engineering Workers,
252, Janta Colony, Ramnarayan Narker Marg,
Ghatkopar (East),
Mumbai-400077.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employer : Mr. S. Z. Chowdhary,
Advocate.
For the Workmen : Mr. Abhay Kulkarni,
Advocate.

Mumbai, dated 13th February, 2003.

AWARD—PART-II

By the Interim Award dated 26-7-02 this Tribunal held that domestic inquiry conducted against the workman Bhowad is fair and proper and the findings recorded by the inquiry officer are not perverse and further held that the reference does not bar under the provisions of Section 22 of the Sick Industrial Undertakings Act. In view of the position Issue No. 3, 4 & 5 remained to be adjudicated by this Tribunal in the light of the provisions of Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act and the decision in Neeta Kapilish V/s. Presiding Officer, Labour Court 1999 ICLR 219.

2. According to the company workman Bhowad alongwith unionised workers about 20-25 on 18-3-97 at about 11.25 a.m. gheraoed the officers of the company viz. Bhagat, Tamhane and Dani in their cabin in the premises of the establishment for their demand which was misbehaviour amounting to misconduct under the provisions of the Model Standing Orders and since the misconduct proved by holding inquiry, Disciplinary Authority imposed punishment of suspending him from work for four days without wages from 25-11-97 to 28-11-97 by the order dated 24-11-97. In so far as action of imposing punishment as per schedule both the parties did not lead any oral evidence by purshis (Exhibit-32).

3. On perusing the record as a whole, and hearing the counsels at length I record my findings on issues 3, 4 & 5 for the reasons mentioned below :—

Issues	Findings
3. Whether the management illegally placed the workman under suspension?	No.
4. Whether their action is justified ?	Yes.
5. If not, what relief the workman is entitled to ?	As per order below.

REASONS

4. At the outset the Learned Counsel Mr. Chowdhary for the company submitted that the schedule under adjudication pertains to the action of the management on suspending the workman for four days without wages from 25-11-97 to 28-11-97 by way of punishment cannot be interfered by the Tribunal since it does not fall under section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act. He urged that the industrial tribunal under the said provision can only interfere with the Managerial orders on discharge, dismissal, termination directing the reinstatement imposing such terms and conditions as it thinks fit however, in the instant case the punishment is on suspension of workman which cannot be interfered by the tribunal. On going through the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and the punishment imposed on the workman, this tribunal cannot interfere with the same as rightly urged by Mr. Chowdhary.

5. Mr. Kulkarni the Learned Counsel for the workman inviting attention to Section 14 of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Central Rules, 1946 urged with force that the Tribunal though only interfere with the Managerial orders discharge, dismissal, termination the illegality committed by the management company can certain be cured by it by way of social relief under the Industrial Disputes Act and the rules. He submits that pending the inquiry workman was suspended from 18-3-97 to 24-11-97 i.e., more than four days and that under the said provisions the remaining period of suspension workman is entitled to the wages as he would have received if he had not been under suspension after deducting the subsistence allowance paid to him for such period since 22-3-97 to 24-11-97 i.e., after four days from 18-3-97 to 21-3-97. In the case in hand punishment imposed upon the workman after due inquiry was of suspending workman for four days from work without wages from 25-11-97 to 28-11-97 as seen from the schedule and that this tribunal has to consider the legality of this punishment. It is settled law that the tribunal cannot traverse beyond the scope of the schedule. In this view of the matter, the submission of Mr. Kulkarni in so far as present reference is concerned, is not relevant and therefore cannot be considered.

6. The punishment imposed upon the workman since does not fall under Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act this Tribunal cannot interfere with the same. Consequently no relief can be awarded to the workman. In this context the action of the management in suspending the workman being legal and justified and workman not entitled to any relief, issues are answered accordingly and hence the order :—

ORDER

The action of the management of M/s. Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd., Muland Works, Mumbai in suspending Shri L. N. Bhowad is legal and justified.

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1656.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिचर्ड्सन एण्ड क्रुडास लिमिटेड, 1972 के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ऑद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. 2, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी.-2/59/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/13/2000-आई.आर.(डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th May, 2003

S.O.1656.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/59 of 2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 2 Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Richardson & Crudas Ltd., 1972 Mumbai and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-5-2003.

[No. L-42011/13/2000-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II, MUMBAI

PRESENT

S. N. SAUNDANKAR

PRESIDING OFFICER

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/59 OF 2000

Employers in relation to the Management of
General Manager (P&A)

Richardson & Crudas Ltd., 1972

General Manager (P&A),

Richardson & Crudas Ltd. 1972

Mulund Works, L.B.S. Marg,

Mulund, Mumbai-400 080.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

The President,

Association of Engineering Workers,

252, Janta Colony, Ramnarayan Narker Marg,

Ghatkopar (East),

Mumbai-400 077.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employer : Mr. S. Z. Chowdhary,
Advocate.

For the workman : Mr. V.T. Mirajkar,
Advocate.

Mumbai Dated, the 31st March, 2003

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, by its Order No. L-42011/13/2000-IR (DU), dated 19/6/2000 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether the action of the management of Richardson & Crudas (1972) Ltd., Mulund Works, Mumbai by terminating the services of Sh. J.C. VETAL w.e.f. 10-7-99 is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen is entitled?"

2. Workman Vetal was terminated from the service by the company w.e.f. 10-7-99. According to workman he was illegally terminated and therefore he be reinstated with full back wages. Management denied the same contending that workman behaved indecently with his colleagues for which domestic inquiry was held and that inquiry officer found him guilty and based on the report his misconduct, workman was dismissed. On the basis of the pleadings issues were framed at Exhibit-9. When the matter was part-heard both the parties vide purhis (Exhibit-14) pointed out that they have settled the dispute amicably and therefore the same be disposed of and hence the order :—

ORDER

Reference stands disposed of as settled vide (Ex-14).

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE HON'BLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 AT MUMBAI

REFERENCE NO. 59 OF 2000

BETWEEN

M/S. RICHARDSON & CRUDDAS (1972) LTD

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

MAY IT PLEASE THIS HON'BLE COURT :—

The above reference has been settled between the parties on following terms :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- (a) The workman shall be reinstated in the employment of the Company with continuity of service on and from 31-3-2003 & shall be paid an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) towards back wages for the period of suspension and/or unemployment on account of termination of services.
- (b) The agreed amount payable to the workman under the settlement is Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) shall be paid to the workman subject to various statutory deductions.
- (c) The said amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (One Lac Only) shall include Suspension allowance, back wages, bonus, leave wages & various other allowances etc. which the workman would have earned had he not been suspended and/or terminated.
- (d) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall not make any claim of whatsoever nature against the Company in future including any claim in relation to the period of unemployment on account of suspension and/or termination of his services forming subject matter of the above reference except what is agreed hereinabove.
- (e) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall submit his resignation before the end of working hours of 31-3-2003 under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme declared by the Company.
- (f) The Company agrees and undertakes to accept the resignation of the workman under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme and relieve him from the end of working hours of 31-3-2003.
- (g) The Company agrees and undertakes to pay to the workman the amounts payable under this settlement and the Voluntary Retirement Scheme at the time of payment of terminal dues to the other workmen retiring under the said Voluntary Retirement Scheme.
- (h) In view of aforesaid terms and conditions, the parties to the reference shall pray the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 to dispose of the said reference in terms of this settlement."

The parties to this reference, therefore, jointly pray that the above reference may please be disposed of in terms of this settlement.

For Richardson & Cruddas
(1972) Ltd.

(G.B. MISHRA)
General Manager

Workman.

Advocate for the Company.
Advocate for the workman.

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 2003

का. आ.1657.—ऑद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिचर्डसन एंड क्रुडास लिमिटेड, 1972 के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. 2, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी.-2/120/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/227/98-आई.आर.(डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th May, 2003

S.O.1657.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/120 of 99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/ Labour Court No. 2 Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Richardson & Cruddas Ltd., (1972) Mumbai and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-5-2003.

[No. L-42012/227/98-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II, MUMBAI

PRESENT:

S. N. SAUNDANKAR,
PRESIDING OFFICER

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/120 OF 1999

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE
MANAGEMENT OF

The General Manager (P&A)
M/s. Richardson & Cruddas

The General Manager (P&A),
M/s. Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd.,
Mulund Works, L.B.S. Marg,
Mulund, (W) MUMBAI 400 080.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

The President,
Association of Engineering Workers,
252, Janta Colony, Ramnarayan Narker Marg,
Ghatkopar (East),
MUMBAI 400 077.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYERS : Mr. S.Z. Chowdhary
Advocate.

FOR THE WORKMAN : Mr. V.T. Mirajkar
Advocate.

Mumbai Dated, the 31st March, 2003

AWARD—PART-II

By the Interim Award Dtd. 27/12/01 it is held that the domestic inquiry conducted against the workman vitiated and the findings were perverse. Therefore management was directed to lead evidence to justify its action and in that context officers of the company S/Shri Kalwar and Navdikar filed affidavits in lieu of Examination-in-Chief (Exhibit-27/29) and when the matter was fixed for the evidence of third witness by joint purshis (Ex-30) both the parties pointed out that they have settled the dispute amicably and consequently reference be disposed of and hence the order :—

ORDER

Reference stands disposed of settlement vide (Ex-30).

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE HON'BLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 AT MUMBAI.

REFERENCE NO. 120 OF 1999

BETWEEN

M/S. RICHARDSON & CRUDDAS (1972) LTD.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

MAY IT PLEASE THIS HON'BLE COURT :—

The above reference has been settled between the parties on following terms :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- (a) The workman shall be reinstated in the employment of the Company with continuity of service on and from 31-3-2003 & shall be paid an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) towards back wages for the period of suspension and/or unemployment on account of termination of services.
- (b) The agreed amount payable to the workman under the settlement is Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only) shall be paid to the workman subject to various statutory deductions.

- (c) The said amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (One Lac Only) shall include Suspension allowance, back wages, bonus, leave wages & various other allowances etc. which the workman would have earned had he not been suspended and/or terminated.
- (d) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall not make any claim of whatsoever nature against the Company in future including any claim in relation to the period of unemployment on account of suspension and/or termination of his services forming subject matter of the above reference except what is agreed hereinabove.
- (e) The workman agrees and undertakes that he shall submit his resignation before the end of working hours of 31-3-2003 under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme declared by the Company.
- (f) The Company agrees and undertakes to accept the resignation of the workman under the prevailing Voluntary Retirement Scheme and relieve him from the end of working hours of 31-3-2003.
- (g) The Company agrees and undertakes to pay to the workman the amounts payable under this settlement and the Voluntary Retirement Scheme at the time of payment of terminal dues to the other workmen retiring under the said Voluntary Retirement Scheme.
- (h) In view of aforesaid terms and conditions, the parties to the reference shall pray the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1 to dispose of the said reference in terms of this settlement."

The parties to this reference, therefore, jointly pray that the above reference may please be disposed of in terms of this settlement.

For Richardson & Cruddas
(1972) Ltd.

(G.B. MISHRA)
Advocate for the Company.
General Manager
Workman.

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1658.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केंद्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय श्री गंगानगर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 34/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केंद्रीय सरकार को 13-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/89/2002-आई. आर. (बी. II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th May, 2003

S.O.1658.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. 34/2002 of Industrial Tribunal, SRI GANGANAGAR as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Bank of India and their workman, received by the Central Government on 13-05-2003.

[No. L-12012/89/2002-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

अनुबन्ध

श्रम न्यायालय, श्री गंगानगर (राज०)

पीठासीन अधिकारी : श्री देवचंद मीना, आर.एच.जे.एस.

श्रम विवाद प्रसंग सं० 34/2002

मनोहर लाल पुत्र श्री अर्जन राम जाति धानका निवासी ग्राम सरदारपुरा बीका तह० सूरतगढ़ जिला श्री गंगानगर (राज०)।

—प्रार्थी/प्रमिक

बनाम

प्रधान प्रबन्धक बैंक ऑफ इंडिया भारत सरकार का संस्थान शाखा 25 एल.जी.डब्ल्यू. सरदारपुरा बीका, तह० सूरतगढ़ जिला श्री गंगानगर।

—अप्रार्थी/नियोजक

उपस्थित :

1. प्रार्थी प्रमिक की ओर से श्री भूरामल स्वामी।
2. अप्रार्थी नियोजक की ओर से श्री कैलाश जैन।

अधिनिर्णय

दिनांक 19-4-2003

1. सचिव, श्रम मंत्रालय भारत सरकार ने अपनी अधिसूचना क्रमांक एल. 12012/89/2002(आर.बी.~II) नई दिल्ली दिनांक 20-8-2002 के द्वारा निम्न विवाद वास्ते अधिनिर्णय इस न्यायालय को प्रेषित किया, जिस पर यह प्रकरण दिनांक 11-9-2002 को दर्ज रजिस्टर किया जाकर पक्षकारान को सूचना पत्र प्रेषत किये गये :

“Whether it is a fact that the disputant Shri Manohar Lal S/o Arjun Ram was employed during the period from 27-6-1889 to 12-3-2001 by the management of Bank of India if so, whether the managements action to terminate him from service w.e.f. 12-3-2001 is justified and legal? If not justified, what relief is the disputant entitled to?”

2. प्रार्थी की ओर से मांग पत्र प्रस्तुत कर कहा गया है कि वादी की नियुक्ति अप्रार्थी द्वारा दिनांक 27-6-89 को चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के

रिक्त पद पर सफाई कर्मचारी के रूप में की गई। प्रार्थी निरन्तर बिना किसी व्यवधान के उक्त पद पर कार्य किया है व सेवा बिना किसी रुकावट के दिनांक 12-3-2001 तक सुरक्षित नहीं है। प्रार्थी ने प्रत्येक वर्ष में 240 दिन से अधिक कार्य किया है अप्रार्थी ने दिनांक 13-3-2001 को बिना कोई कारण बताये व बिना एक माह का नोटिस दिया व नोटिस के बदले अग्रिम तौर पर एक माह का वेतन दिये व बिना मुआवजा दिये व बिना वरिष्ठता सूची जारी किये अचानक यह बोलकर काम से हटा दिया कि उसकी अब जरूरत नहीं है। प्रार्थी ने नियुक्ति दिनांक से लगातार बिना व्यवधान के द्वारा अंजाम दी है व अप्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थी की सेवामुक्ति अवैध अनुचित व गैर कानूनी है। निवेदन किया कि उसे द्वयूटी पर लिये जाने का स्थाई तौर पर आदेश दिया जावे। प्रार्थी ने अपना विवाद सहायक श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) जंयपुर के समक्ष पेश किया था जहां से असफल बारात प्रतिवेदन होने पर उक्त बाद को भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय को भेजा गया जहां से उक्त बाद इस न्यायालय को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु प्रेषित किया गया है। निवेदन किया कि प्रार्थी को अप्रार्थी के नियोजन में युर्नस्थापित करने का आदेश दिया जावे व प्रार्थी की सेवा स्थाई व निरन्तर मानते हुए बकाया वेतन एरियर व अन्य लाभ दिलाये जावें।

3. अप्रार्थी ने जबाब मांग पत्र प्रस्तुत कर कहा है कि वैंक उद्योग की परिभाषा में नहीं आता है व प्रार्थी का कथन कि प्रार्थी दिनांक 27-5-89 को चतुर्थ श्रेणी सफाई कर्मचारी की नियुक्ति अप्रार्थी वैंक द्वारा की गई थी व 12-3-2001 तक अप्रार्थी वैंक के यहां काम किया गलत है। अप्रार्थी वैंक ने प्रार्थी की नियुक्ति 27-5-89 को नहीं दी गई न ही कोई नियुक्ति पत्र दिया गया न ही कोई वेतन प्रार्थी को 27-5-89 से 12-3-2001 का अप्रार्थी वैंक द्वारा दिया गया। प्रार्थी द्वारा दिनांक 27-5-89 से 12-3-2001 तक कभी भी अप्रार्थी वैंक में स्थायी या अस्थाई वेतन भोगी सफाई या अन्य किसी रूप में कार्य कभी नहीं किया न ही उसके द्वारा कभी 240 दिन कार्य किया। प्रार्थी का यह कथन कि प्रार्थी ने उक्त विवाद सहायक श्रम आयुक्त केन्द्रीय जंयपुर द्वारा निरस्त किया जाकर बंद हो चुका है इसलिए प्रार्थीना-पत्र निरस्त किये जाने योग्य है। प्रार्थी अप्रार्थी वैंक का कर्मचारी नहीं है न ही उसने कोई कार्य किया है इसलिए प्रार्थी किसी प्रकार का आदेश बाबत नियुक्ति पाने का अधिकारी नहीं है न ही कोई अनुतोष पाने का अधिकारी है। निवेदन किया है प्रार्थी का मांग पत्र निरस्त किया जावे।

4. प्रार्थी की ओर से मांग पत्र के समर्थन में स्वयं का शपथ-पत्र एवं दस्तावेजात प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू 1 से 24 तक की फोटोस्टेट प्रतिया पेश की गई है।

5. अप्रार्थी की ओर से बालकिशन शर्मा का शपथ-पत्र एवं दस्तावेजात प्रदर्श एम-1 से 14 की फोटोस्टेट प्रतिया पेश की गई है।

6. प्रार्थी के शपथ-पत्र पर अप्रार्थी की ओर से एवं अप्रार्थी के शपथ गृहिता बालकिशन शर्मा के शपथ-पत्र पर प्रार्थी की ओर से प्रति परीक्षण किया गया।

7. उभय पक्षकारान के प्रतिनिधिगण की बहस सुनी गई व पत्रावली का भलीभांति अवलोकन किया गया।

8. विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक ने बहस के दोरान जाहिर किया कि विपक्षी संस्थान उद्योग की परिभाषा में कवर होता है तथा श्रमिक की नियुक्ति दिनांक 27-6-89 को चतुर्थी श्रेणी कर्मचारी के रिक्त पद पर सफाई कर्मचारी के रूप में की गई थी एवं उसने रित्तर बिना किसी व्यवधान के उक्त पद पर कार्य किया। प्रार्थी से सफाई कर्मचारी वाटरमैन पानी भरने तथा पिलाने, डाक देने व लेने की ड्युटी अप्रार्थी द्वारा ली गई एवं प्रार्थी की सेवा बिना किसी रुकावट के दिनांक 12-3-2001 तक सुरक्षित व लगातार रही है तथा 27-6-89 से 12-3-2001 तक कार्य किया तथा प्रत्येक साल में 240 दिन से अधिक कार्य किया है। 1989 में 150 दिन, 1991 में 295 दिन, 1992 में 296 दिन, 1992 में 300 दिन, 1993 में 240 दिन प्रार्थी द्वारा काम किया तथा 27-6-89 से 12-3-2001 तक लगातार प्रत्येक वर्ष में 240 दिन से अधिक कार्य किया है प्रार्थी ने दिनांक 13-3-2001 को बिना किसी कारण हटा दिया। श्रमिक की छंटनी आदेशात्मक प्रावधानों के वितरित की गई है तथा कथन के समर्थन में प्रदत्त डब्ल्यू 1 से 24 तक फोटोप्रतियां पेश की है।

9. विपक्षी ने बहस के दोरान जाहिर किया है कि बैंक उद्योग की परिभाषा में नहीं आता इसलिए औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम के प्रावधान लागू नहीं होते। अप्रार्थी बैंक एच्चिक अप्पर टेकिंग है व केन्द्रीय सरकार का उपकरण है इसलिए इस प्रकार का विवाद सेन्ट्रल गवर्नरमेन्ट इंडस्ट्रीयल ट्रिब्युनल कम लेबर कोर्ट जयपुर के अधीन आता है। श्रमिक द्वारा 27-5-89 से चतुर्थी श्रेणी कर्मचारी के पद पर नियुक्त करने का कथन गलत है व उसके द्वारा 12-3-2001 तक अप्रार्थी बैंक के यहां काम किया यह भी गलत बताया है। प्रार्थी की नियुक्ति 27-5-89 को नहीं की गई न ही कोई नियुक्ति पत्र दिया गया न ही कोई वेतन प्रार्थी को 27-5-89 से 12-3-2001 का अप्रार्थी बैंक द्वारा दिया गया उक्त तथ्य के समर्थन में हाजरी रजिस्टर की प्रति जो प्रदर्श 1 से 13 तक अवलोकनार्थी पेश किया गये हैं तथा इस दोरान कभी भी किसी तरह का काम नहीं दिया है। उक्त विवाद 1996 में सहायक श्रम आयुक्त जयपुर में किया था जो निरस्त किया आकर खत्म हो चुका है पुनः उन्हीं तथ्यों का लाने का अधिकारी नहीं है तथा जब बैंक का कर्मचारी नहीं था तो छुट्टी की दरखास्त देने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है।

10. हमने दोनों पक्षों की बहस के अनुसरण में निम्न प्रश्नों पर विचार करना हैं :

“आया मनोहर लाल पुत्र श्री अर्नुन राम बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया में दिनांक 27-6-89 से 12-3-2001 तक नियोजित था यदि हां तो क्या नियोजक ने दिनांक 12-3-2001 को उसे कार्य से हटा दिया था जो न्यायोचित था या नहीं ?

11. सबसे पहले उसकी नियुक्ति से सम्बन्धित बिन्दु पर विचार करना है। श्रमिक अपने बयान में दिनांक 27-6-89 को चतुर्थी श्रेणी कर्मचारी के रिक्त पद पर अप्रार्थी संस्थान बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया शाखा 25

एल. जी. डब्ल्यू में सफाई कर्मचारी के पद पर नियुक्त होने की बात कहता है तथा निरन्तर बिना किसी व्यवधान के कार्य करने की बात कहता है तथा कार्य में सफाई कर्मचारी, वाटर मैन और डाक वितरण का कार्य करना व प्रत्येक वर्ष में 240 दिन से अधिक कार्य करना चाहता है तथा 12-3-2001 तक कार्य करने की बात कहता है। दिनांक 27-6-89 से प्रारम्भ होकर 12-3-2001 तक लगातार कार्य करना कहता है तथा इसमें 1989 में 150 दिन, 1990 में 295 दिन, 1991 में 196 दिन, 1992 में 300 दिन, 1993 में 249 दिन कार्य करना कहता है तथा दिनांक 13-3-2001 को बिना कोई कारण बताये व बिना नोटिस दिये बिना मुआवजा दिये व बिना वरिष्ठता सूचि जारी किये अचानक यह कह कर काम से हटा दिया कि अब उसकी जरूरत नहीं है तथा उसने प्रदर्श डब्ल्यू 1 से 24 तक दस्तावेज की फोटो प्रति पेश की है। जिरह में यह गवाह अपना नाम मनोहर लाल होना कहता है तथा कोई नियुक्ति पत्र नहीं दिया जाना मौखिक रूप से नियुक्त करना कहता है तथा मौखिक रूप से बैंक मैनजर ने नियुक्ति की थी। दिनांक 27-6-89 को नियुक्ति दी थी। बैंक का कार्य डाक ले जाना लाना, सफाई पानी भरना आदि काम के पांच रुपये प्रति रोज में रखा था। यह गलत है कि सरकारी बैंक बिना नियुक्ति पत्र कोई नियुक्ति नहीं होती हो। काम करते हुए का जयपुर में केस नहीं किया। किसी का निजी काम करता हो यह गलत है बैंक का काम ही किया था। पहले 5 फिर 7, 9, 15, 25, 40 प्रतिदिन तनखाह बढ़ी थी। तनखाह का कोई प्रमाण-पत्र नहीं है। यह गलत है कि ज्ञात बयान दे रहा हूँ। प्रदर्श 24 पास बुक है। तनखाह इस पास बुक में 50 रुपये जमा है जो 5×10 माह है तथा इसमें 55 रुपये जमा है। इन दो के अलावा अन्य जमा नहीं है। यह गलत है कि उसने बैंक में कार्य नहीं किया हो यह भी गलत है कि बैंक में नियुक्ति नहीं हुई हो।

12. इसके विपरित विपक्षी की ओर से बालकृष्ण पेश हुआ है जो दिनांक 27-6-89 से 12-3-2001 तक किसी प्रकार से कार्य करने से मना करता है तथा कोई नियुक्ति नहीं देना कहता है न ही बैंक से नौकरी से हटाना कहता है तथा प्रार्थना-पत्र कार्यालय श्रम आयुक्त केन्द्रीय जयपुर में 1996 में दिया जो जे.पी./7/1/96 दर्ज हुआ जो खारिज हो चुका है कहता है तथा हाजरी रजिस्टर प्रतियां 1 से 10 तक पेश की हैं जो 1989 से 2001 तक हैं उनमें कहीं भी हाजरी नहीं होने की बात कहता है। यह जिरह में कहता है कि मनोहर लाल की बैंक द्वारा न कभी नियुक्ति दी न ही उसे हटाया। मनोहर लाल कभी भी बैंक का किसी भी तरह से स्थाई या अस्थाई या अन्य किसी तरह से कर्मचारी नहीं रहा। बैंक के हाजरी रजिस्टर 28 जून 1989 से सन् 2001 तक के आज लाया हूँ इससे मनोहर लाल की कोई हाजरी नहीं है व रजिस्टरों में मनोहर लाल का नाम नहीं है प्रत्येक रजिस्टर की प्रथम पृष्ठ की प्रति पेश की है डब्ल्यू 2 व 3 पत्र बैंक के कर्मचारी द्वारा नहीं लिखा है न ही विभाग में ऐसा कोई पत्र है। इसमें जमा मजदूरी लिखी है परन्तु मजदूरी लिखने का रिवाज नहीं है हो सकता है जोड़ा गया हो। यह गलत है कि मनोहर लाल को बैंक में नियुक्ति किया गया हो व यह गलत है कि उसकी छंटनी की हो इस प्रकार से दोनों पक्षों की साक्ष्य है। जैसा कि मनोहर लाल अपने बयान में स्पष्ट रूप से जिरह में स्वीकार करता है कि उसे किसी प्रकार

का नियुक्ति पत्र नहीं दिया केवल मौखिक साक्ष्य है जो अपने बयान में मौखिक रूप से दिनांक 27-6-89 को नियुक्त करना व 12-3-2001 तक के काम करना व प्रत्येक साल में 240 दिन काम करना होता है परन्तु इससे सम्बन्धित नियुक्ति पत्र व तनख्ताह से सम्बन्धित कोई दस्तावेज पेश नहीं किया है जिससे कि विभाग में उसकी नियुक्ति होना साबित होती है। जहां तक दस्तावेजी साक्ष्य है उसमें डब्ल्यू 1 औद्योगिक विवाद के लिए सहायक श्रम आयुक्त केन्द्रीय के यहां पर प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है, डब्ल्यू 2 बैंक के द्वारा किसी आर.जी.शर्मा के प्रार्थना-पत्र के आधार पर जानकारी दी है जिसमें 9 रुपये इकाई के व महीने के 65 रुपये दिये जाने की बात कहता है तथा इसमें मनोहर लाल को भुगतान प्रबन्धक के माध्यम से दिया जाना कहता है। इस पत्र के लिए विषयकी लालकृष्ण यह विभाग का पत्र नहीं है तथा फर्जी होना कहता है तथा डब्ल्यू 3,4,5 इसके सम्बन्ध में सरमच, डायरेक्टर व अन्य व्यक्तियों के हस्ताक्षरों का प्रमाण-पत्र है परन्तु यह केवल मात्र श्रमिक की ओर से दिया गया है जिन पर बैंक का कोई पृष्ठांकन नहीं है तथा हल्फनामा डब्ल्यू 6 हेतराम का है लेकिन यह भी काम नहीं करना व मनोहर लाल का काम करना कहता है तथा 7 हल्फनामा है डब्ल्यू 8 मनोहर लाल द्वाय दिया गया ऐप्रेजेन्टेशन है डब्ल्यू 9 स्वयं के द्वारा दिया गया ऐप्रेजेन्टेशन है डब्ल्यू 10 रजिस्ट्री व 11 ए.डी की नकल है डब्ल्यू 12 अवकाश का प्रार्थना-पत्र व डब्ल्यू 13 व 14 बैंक की रसीद व ए.डी है तथा 15 भी प्रार्थना-पत्र है डब्ल्यू 16 रजिस्ट्री की नकल व 17 ए.डी है इसी तरह डब्ल्यू 18 प्रार्थना-पत्र है तथा डब्ल्यू 19 डाक की नकल व 20 ए.डी. है डब्ल्यू 21 प्रार्थना-पत्र छट्टी का है तथा डब्ल्यू 22 डाक की रसीद व 23 ए.डी. की नकल है डब्ल्यू 24 मनोहर लाल का बैंक खाता है परन्तु डब्ल्यू 3 से 23 तक जो भी दस्तावेजों हैं वे मनोहर लाल के हैं इस पर बैंक का कोई पृष्ठांकन नहीं है न ही कोई कार्यवाही किये जाने का पृष्ठांकन है। ऐसी सूरत में इन दस्तावेजों जो एकतरफा है यदि मनोहर लाल द्वारा लिखे गये हैं तो ये उसकी नियुक्ति साबित करने के लिए पर्याप्त नहीं हैं क्योंकि कोई व्यक्ति यदि पत्र लिखता है तो उससे यह साबित नहीं होता कि वह बैंक के कर्मचारी के रूप में हो जब तक नियुक्ति पत्र या बैंक के रजिस्टर में उसकी हाजरी न हो जबकि रजिस्टर के मुताबिक उसकी हाजरी कहीं नहीं है जो 1989 से 2001 तक के पेश किये हैं। ऐसी सूरत में हमारी विनम्र राय में श्रमिक के पास न तो कोई नियुक्ति पत्र है न ही उसकी नियुक्ति से सम्बन्धित ऐसा कोई दस्तावेज है। ऐसी सूरत में इन दस्तावेजों से यह साबित नहीं होता कि श्रमिक बैंक में 1989 से 2001 तक कर्मचारी रहा है। बल्कि ये स्वयं के लिखे गये पत्र हैं जिससे उसकी नियुक्ति साबित नहीं होती। जहां तक बचत खाता पी.डब्ल्यू 24 का प्रश्न है इसमें उसके खाता सं. 74 में उसके एड्रेस सरदारपुरा तह, सूरतगढ़ का दिया गया है उसमें 50 रुपये मजदूरी के जमा होने की बात कहता है जो एक ही बार है परन्तु इससे यह साबित नहीं होता कि उसके खाते में तनख्ताह जमा हुई हो। यदि वास्तविक रूप से खाते में जमा होती तो हर माह की या हर साल की जमा होती। ऐसी सूरत में इसके आधार पर यह साबित नहीं होता कि श्रमिक बैंक में नौकरी करता हो तथा एफ.आई.आर पेश हुई है जिसमें भी श्रमिक का संदिग्ध आवरण बताया गया है तथा एक उपअधीक्षक को शिकायत लिखी गई है परन्तु

चूंकि जो दस्तावेज पेश हुए हैं वे मौखिक साक्ष्य को स्पोर्ट नहीं करते ये स्वयं के बनाये हुए हैं जिनका बैंक में कोई इन्द्राज नहीं है तथा बैंक एक सरकारी उपक्रम है जिसमें बिना नियुक्ति पत्र के इतने लम्बे समय तक नियुक्ति नहीं रखी जा सकती क्योंकि प्रत्येक खर्च का बाडचर बनता है। ऐसी सूरत में हमारी विनम्र राय में श्रमिक ने जो शहादत पेश की है उसके आधार पर विषयकी नियोजित बैंक के पास न तो सफाई कर्मचारी के रूप में नियुक्ति होना साबित होता है न ही उसके द्वारा लगातार काम करना साबित होता। यदि वह नौकरी में होता तो रिकार्ड में उसका नाम अवश्य होता तथा सरकारी रिकार्ड से उपधारणा यही बनती है कि वह बैंक में नियोजित नहीं था तथा श्रमिक के जो दस्तावेज है वे एकतरफा हैं ऐसी सूरत में उन पर विश्वास नहीं किया जा सकता कि वह नौकर था। इसके अलावा श्रमिक ने अपने शपथ-पत्र में 1989 से 1993 तक कार्य दिवस की गणना दी है परन्तु उसके बाद की गणना नहीं दी है ऐसी सूरत में श्रमिक का सारा केस संदिग्ध हो जाता है। यदि वास्तव में कार्य करता तो 1993 के बाद की गणना अवश्य देता। ऐसी सूरत में श्रमिक विषयकी बैंक के यहां न तो नियोजित होना साबित होता है एवं जब नियोजित नहीं था तो 12-3-2001 को उसे हटाये जाने का प्रश्न ही स्वतः ही समाप्त हो जाता है। जब श्रमिक न तो नियोजित था न ही उसे दिनांक 12-3-2001 को हटाया। ऐसी सूरत में आई.डी.एक्ट के प्रावधानों की पालना का प्रश्न ही नहीं है। ऐसी सूरत में न तो श्रमिक बैंक में दिनांक 27-6-89 को नियोजित होना साबित होता है न ही दिनांक 12-3-2001 को हटाया जाना साबित होता है न ही दिनांक 27-6-89 से 12-3-2001 तक नियोजित रहना साबित होता है। ऐसी सूरत में श्रमिक कोई राहत पाने का अधिकारी नहीं है।

13. जहां तक सेन्ट्रल गर्वनमेन्ट इण्डस्ट्रीयल ट्रिब्यूनल जयपुर में केस करने का प्रश्न व क्षेत्राधिकार का प्रश्न है चूंकि गंगानगर क्षेत्र का मामला है इसलिए इस न्यायालय के केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा रेफरेंस प्रेषित किया है ऐसी सूरत में यह मामला इस न्यायालय को सुनने का अधिकार है ऐसी सूरत में विषयकी का यह कहना कि अधिकार नहीं है मानने योग्य नहीं है। जहां तक जयपुर में केस चलने का प्रश्न है शुरू में एक दस्तावेज पेश की थी जो 16-12-02 को धारा 10^{की} पेस नहीं की है ऐसी सूरत में वह खारिज हो चुकी है ऐसी सूरत में पहले केस चलाया जाना नहीं माना जा सकता।

अधिनिर्णय

14. अतः श्रमिक मनोहर लाल का अप्रार्थी बैंक में दिनांक 27-6-89 को नियोजित होना व दिनांक 12-3-2001 को हटाया जाना साबित नहीं होंगे एवं 27-6-89 से 12-3-2001 तक नियोजित रहना साबित नहीं होने से श्रमिक कोई राहत पाने का अधिकारी नहीं है।

15. अधिनिर्णय आज दिनांक 19-4-2003 को खुले न्यायालय में लिखाया जाकर सुनाया गया।

डी. सी. मीना, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 2003

का. आ.1659—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947
 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मुम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अम न्यायालय नं० 2—मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 2/24/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-31011/20/2000-आई.आर.(एम)]
 सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th May, 2003

S.O.1659.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 2/24 of 2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. 2, Mumbai as shown in the annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mumbai Post Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-5-2003.

[No. L-31011/20/2000-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II MUMBAI

Present:

S. N. SAUNDANKAR,
Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT- 2/24 of 2001

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT
OF MUMBAI PORT TRUST

Mumbai Port Trust,
The Chairman
Mumbai 400038

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

Mumbai Port Trust Dock & Genl.
Employees Union
The Secretary, Kamgar Sadan,
Mazagaon, Mumbai-10

APPEARANCES:

For the Employer	:	Mr. Umesh Nabar, Advocate.
For the Workman	:	Mr. Jaiprakash Sawant Advocate.

Mumbai, Dated 7th February , 2003

AWARD PART-I

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L 31011/20/2000/IR(M) dated 2-2-2001 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

“Whether the action of the management of Mumbai Post Trust, Mumbai in terminating the services of Shri B.K. Bahlani, Asstt. Shed Superintendent by way of removal from service w.e.f. 16-12-98 is legal and justified? If not what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. Workman Bahlani was appointed as tally clerk in the Port Trust in the year 1962. He was Assistant Shed Superintendent in the Docks Department at the time of removal on 16-12-98. Union vide Statement of Claim (Ex-6) averred that on 14-6-96 workman was on 2nd shift duty from 5.00 p.m. to 11.00 p.m. and had done overtime as usual from 11.00 p.m to 11.30 p.m at 'K' Plot, Cotton Depot. It is contended workman was issued chargesheet dtd. 28-4-97 alleging he was found sleeping while on duty under the influence of liquor. It is pleaded charge levelled against the workman was vague and that inquiry officer who had interest in the company completed the inquiry hurriedly on 6-5-98 and that the inquiry was not fair and proper and based on the report workman services were terminated by way of removal from 16-12-98. It is pleaded inquiry was not fair and that the inquiry officer recorded the findings without any basis, and that the findings are perverse. Consequently inquiry being improper it be set aside.

3. Management Port Trust resisted the claim of workman union by filing Written Statement (Exhibit-7) contending that the inquiry was fair and proper and that the based on the findings Disciplinary Authority removed the workman from service. It is pleaded that the workman was found sleeping on duty under the influence of liquor. Which was seen by Assistant Manager Mr. Rao for which misconduct he was issued chargesheet and that the said chargesheet was found proved and on the basis of the inquiry report workman was removed from service. It is pleaded sufficient opportunity was given to the workman and that the appeal preferred by the workman against the order of a Disciplinary Authority was turned down. It is contended finding is based on the evidence and material on record are not perverse. Consequently management prayed to dismiss the claim of union workman.

4. On the basis of pleadings preliminary issues were framed at Exhibit-10. Both the parties by joint pursuant (Exhibit-14) did not lead oral evidence.

5. Workman filed written submissions (Exhibit-15) alongwith copies of rulings. On perusing the record as a whole, written submissions and hearing both sides I record my findings on the following preliminary issues for the reasons mentioned below :

Issues	Findings
1. Whether the domestic inquiry conducted against the workman was as per the Principles of Natural Justice?	Yes
2. Whether the finding of the inquiry officer are perverse?	No

Reasons

6. So far domestic inquiry is concerned. Their Lordships of the Apex Court in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works V/s. Their workmen, 1963 II LLJ SSC pg. 367 ruled that enquiry cannot be said to have been properly held unless:

- (1) The employee proceeded against has been informed clearly of the charges levelled against him.
- (2) The witnesses are examined ordinarily in the presence of the employee in respect of the charges.
- (3) The employee is given a fair opportunity to cross examine witnesses.
- (4) He is given a fair opportunity to examine witnesses including himself in his defence if he so wishes on any relevant matter, and
- (5) The inquiry officer records his findings with reasons for the same in his report.

7. The Learned Counsel Mr. Sawant inviting attention to the inquiry proceedings filed with list (Exhibit -13) submitted that the charges levelled against the workman were vague and further urged that the inquiry officer with laconic reasons prepared report dtd. 18-9-98 which according to him was non-application of mind thereby vitiates the inquiry. On the other hand the learned counsel Mr. Nabar submits that inquiry officer analysing the evidence of the management witnesses in detail recorded the findings. So far reasoning and findings of the inquiry officer are concerned, it is relevant to quote the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Anilkumar V/s. Presiding Officer & Ors. Reported in AIR 1985 SC 1121 Cited by Mr. Sawant wherein their Lordships observed in para 5-6:

“An enquiry report in a quasi-judicial enquiry must show the reasons for the conclusion. It cannot be an ipse dixit of the Enquiry Officer. It has to be speaking order in the sense that the conclusion is supported by reasons. This too well settle to be supported by a precedent. In

Madhya Pradesh Industries Ltd. V/s. Union of India, (1966) 1 CSR 466: (AIR 1966 SC 671) this court observed that a speaking order will at best be a reasonable and at its worst be atleast a plausible one. The public should not be deprived of this only safeguard. Similarly in Mahabir Prasad V/s. State of Uttar Pradesh, (1971) 1 SCR 201: (AIR 1970 SC 1302) this court reiterated that satisfactory decision of a disputed claim may be reached only if it be supported by the most cogent reasons that appealed to the authority. It should all the more be so where the quasi-judicial enquiry may result in deprivation of livelihood or attach a stigma to the character. In this case the enquiry report is an order sheet which merely produces the stage through which the enquiry passed. It clearly disclosed a total non-application of mind and it is this report on which the General Manager acted in terminating the service of the appellant. There could not have been a gross case of no application of mind and it is such an enquiry which has found favour with the Labour Court and the High Court.

Where a disciplinary enquiry affects the livelihood and is likely to cast a stigma and it has to be held in accordance with the Principles of Natural Justice the minimum expectation is that the report must be a reasoned one. The court then not enter into the adequacy or sufficiency of evidence. But where the evidence is annexed to an order sheet an no cor-election is established between the two showing application of mind, we are constrained to observe that is not an enquiry report at all. Therefore, there was no enquiry in this case worth the name and the order of termination based on such proceeding disclosing non-application of mind would be unsustainable.”

8. It was alleged that the workman misbehaved while on duty during third shift on 14-6-96 at 'K' point Cotton Depot amounting to misconduct under the Regulations No. 3(1A). On perusal of the inquiry proceedings it is seen the witnesses examined by the management narrated the incident and analysing that the inquiry officer in his last para pg. 19-20 (Exhibit -13/2) recorded the conclusions. It is not that evidence was not analysed and no reasons were recorded. In this above decisions cited by Mr. Sawant no reasons were assigned and that there was no analysis of the evidence in that case, therefore Their Lordships held that inquiry was no application of mind and consequently held it unsustainable, therefore that decision is no avail to the union. Workman Bahlani in his Statement of Claim challenged the inquiry on one of the grounds that the charges were vague, however on pursing the inquiry proceedings filed with list

(Exhibit-12) chargesheet dtd. 28-7-97 clearly depict the position therefore those cannot be said to be vague and not clear. It is seen inquiry was commenced on 17-4-98 and the report was prepared on 18-9-98. It is not that on one day it was completed. Workman nowhere in his statement of claim averred that he was not given opportunity. Therefore going through the inquiry proceeding, I find no substance in the submission of Mr. Sawant that inquiry vitiates, on any ground.

9. So far perversity of findings is concerned, 'perversity' is that when the findings are such which no reasonable person would have arrived at on the basis of the material before him. As stated above, inquiry officer referring the evidence on record, recorded the findings, therefore cannot said to be perverse. It is therefore clear that inquiry was fair and proper and the findings not perverse. Issues are answered accordingly and hence the order:—

ORDER

The domestic inquiry conducted against the workman was as per the Principles of Natural Justice. The findings of the inquiry officer are not perverse.

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer
नई दिल्ली, 20 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1660.—ओद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा० को०को०लि० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोंकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट ओद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार ओद्योगिक अधिकरण II, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 6/1993) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/44/92-आई.आर. (सी-1)]
एस.एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th May, 2003

S.O.1660.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 6/1993) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal II, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-20012/44/92-IR (C-1)]
S.S GUPTA, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) AT DHANBAD.

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10 (1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 6 OF 1993

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of M/S. BCCL and their workman

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : Shri A.K. Jha, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers : Shri H. Nath, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand : Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 29th April, 2003.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/44/92-I.R. (Coal-I), dated, the 26th February, 1993.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of M/s. B.C.C. Koala Bhawan, P.O. Koyla Nagar, Dist. Dhanbad, in not designating Shri Krishna Nandan Prasad Yadav, as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic w.e.f. 27-7-82 with all benefits is justified when Shri Mofiz Alam, Bachu Yadav and K.P. Yadav were designated as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic in 1985 without facing the interview/test? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workmen according to W.S. submitted by the sponsoring Union on his behalf in brief is as follows :—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workman was appointed as Electrician Apprentice by the management w.e.f. 8-9-75. Thereafter vide circular No. BCCL PA-1/Interview/AC Plant/82/40071 dt. 23-7-82 the management invited applications from departmental candidates for interview for the post of A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic in E.D.P. Department and in response to that circular the concerned workman appeared in the test on 27-7-82 and was selected by the management vide office order No. BCCL : 85 : EDP : 21 : 967 of 3I-8-85 and was directed to work as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic. They submitted that thereafter vide office order No. BCCL 86 : EDP : 21 : 198 dt. 3-12-86 the management reverted back the concerned workman to his original post of Electrician and thereafter did not regularise him to the post of A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic. They alleged that the management without taking any Departmental interview designated Md. Mofiz Alam, Miner/Loader, K.P. Yadav, Mechanical Fitter and Bachu Yadav, Electrical Helper as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic w.e.f. 1983 though all those

workmen were juniors to him. Accordingly, the concerned workman after raising industrial dispute through his sponsoring union submitted prayer for his regularisation to the post of A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic w.e.f. 27-7-82 along with difference of wages and other consequential benefits.

3. Management on the contrary after filling W.S.-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the W.S. submitted by them on behalf of the concerned workman.

4. They submitted that the concerned workman is working as an Electrician in Cat. VI at E.D.P. Department, Koyala Bhawan. They submitted that since the workman is working as an electrician he is required to look after the electrical requirements of A.C. Plant, D.G. Set and other electrical works fittings at E.D.P. Department. They submitted that since the concerned workman is an electrician, working at E.D.P. Department, his posting in A.C. Plant only, cannot be made, as his services are also required in other sections of the said department. They disclosed that the A.C. Plant Operators who are operating the A.C. Plant at E.D.P. Department are in lower grade than the grade which the concerned workman is enjoying. Moreover, they are working from the very inception of the A.C. Plant. They submitted that when the sponsoring Union raised an industrial dispute over this issues before the ALC(C) Dhanbad they vide letter No. BCCL/PA-5/ID/KNP Yadav/91 dt. 22-10-91 explained the facts of the case and informed that there was no vacant post of A.C. Plant Operator and accordingly the question of engaging the concerned workman as A.C. Plant Operator did not arise. Again vide letter No. BCCL/PA/5/ID/KNP Yadav/91 dt. 21-12-91 they submitted further that out of three A.C. Plant Operators at E.D.P. Department Sri Mofiz Alam and Sri Bachu Yadav are in Technical Grade-D and Sri Bhola Singh as in Cat. II. It was further submitted that Shri Mofiz Alam and Sri Bachu Yadav who are in Cat. IV on the date they started working as A.C. Plant Operators and after their promotion they were designated as A.C. Plant operator-cum-Mechanic in Technical Grade-D which is lower post than Cat. VI in which the concerned workman is working. They further submitted that the concerned workman is working as Electrician at E.D.P. Department and his services as Electrician are required by the said Department for maintenance of all electrical equipments and that there is no provision in the cadre scheme that an Electrician in Cat. VI can be posted as A.C. Plant Operator. Accordingly, the management have submitted their prayer to pass award rejecting the claim of the concerned workman.

5. The points to be decided in this reference are :—

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., Koyala Bhawan, P.O. Koyala Nagar, Dist. Dhanbad, in not designating Sri Krishna Nandan

Prasad Yadav, as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic w.e.f. 27-7-82 with all benefits is justified when Shri Mofiz Alam, Bachu Yadav and K. P. Yadav were designated as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic in 1985 without facing the interview/test? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

FINDING WITH REASONS

6. From the record it transpires that the sponsoring union in order to substantiate their claim has examined the concerned workman as witness. Simultaneously the management also examined one witness in order to substantiate their claim.

7. Here the point for consideration is whether the management is illegally and arbitrarily refused to designate the concerned workman as A.C. Operator-cum-Mechanic or not inspite of his legitimate claim. It is the contention of the concerned workman that he got his appointment as Trainee Electrician under the management with effect from 8-9-75. The contention of the concerned workman is that in view of circular issued by the management for holding departmental interview/test for the promotion of A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic of E.D.P. Deptt. vide No. B.C.C.L./PA-1/Interview/AC/Plant/82/40071 dt. 23-7-82 he appeared before the said selection on 27-7-82. The said interview letter in course of evidence of the concerned workman was marked as Ext. W-2. While his appointment letter as trainee apprentice/electrical/was marked as Ext. W-1. This interview letter definitely has supported the claim of the concerned workman in the matter of his appearance in the test for selection of A.C. Operator/Mechanic. It is curious to note that no material is forthcoming if the concerned workman was selected as A.C. Operator/Mechanic by the management. However, from the office order dt. 31-8-85 (Ex. W-3) it transpires that as Electrician the concerned workman was placed on shifting duty to operate the A.C. Plant. Thereafter vide office order dt. 3-12-86 (Ext. W-4) the concerned workman was taken the duties of relieving the A/C Plant Operators-cum-Mechanic on their weekly days of rest and directed to report in general shift to attend the electrical problems of the diesel Generator sets in the E.D.P. Deptt. Considering the documents marked as Ext. W-3 and W-4 it transpires that he was placed in the A.C. Plant to perform relieving duties of the A.C. Plant Operators-cum-Mechanic for the period from 31-8-85 to 3-12-86. During this period he was never designated as A.C. Operator-cum-Mechanic by the management.

8. It is the contention of the concerned workman that inspite of his rendering service as A.C. Operator-cum-Mechanic for the period mentioned above the management did not consider necessary to regularise him in the said post. He alleged that Md. Mofiz Alam, Miner/Loader, K.P. Yadav Mechanical Fitter and Bachau Yadav Electrical Helper have been designated as A.C. Operators-cum-Mechanic with effect from 1983 although they were not only very

junior to him but also they did not appear at the departmental interview held on 27-7-82 for the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. His allegation is that the management ignoring his claim arbitrarily and illegally designated those three workmen A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. From the office order dt. 31-8-85 Ext. W-3 it transpires that those three workmen viz. K.P. Yadav, Bachu Yadav and Md. Mofiz Alam were designated as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic while the concerned workman was designated as Electrician. It is the specific contention of the concerned workman that those three workmen had been designated as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic with effect from 1983 by the management without facing any interview to that effect. On the contrary inspite of his appearing before the interview Board on 27-9-82 and the selection for the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic his service was not regularised in the said post. He alleged that instead management reverted him back to his original post. No material evidence is forthcoming to show that he was selected as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic in view of his interview dt. 27-7-82. No material evidence is forthcoming to show that these three workmen by order of the management in the year 1983 were designated as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. From the document marked as Ext. W-3 on the contrary speaks clearly that not as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic but as Electrician he was directed to work in A.C. Plant. Accordingly, considering the materials on record there is scope to presume that though the concerned workman appeared in the test was not at all selected for the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. On the contrary management relying on the service excerpts of the workman viz. Md. Mafiz Alam, Bachu Yadav and K.P. Yadav, Ext. M-4, M-6 and M-8 submitted that these workmen entered into service prior to the joining of the concerned workman in his service. From these documents it transpires that Md. Mofiz Alam, Bachu Yadav and K.P. Yadav joined their services under the management on 20-12-78, 8-6-66 and on 1-11-76 respectively. According to their service experts it transpires that all these workmen are discharging their duties under the management of E.D.P. Deptt. as A.C. plant operator-cum-Mechanic. It is seen that the concerned workman submitted several representations before the management since 1985 for deploying him in the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. In the representations he raised the question how the management deployed general mazdoor or Peon as A.C. Plant Operator ignoring his claim who is an experienced person and whose service could easily be deployed. His representations in course of evidence was marked as Ext. W-5, W-7, W-8, W-9, W-11 and W-12 to W-17.

9. On the contrary management vide letter dt. 28-7-89 marked as Ext. W-10 regretted the prayer of the concerned workman as no such post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic was lying vacant. In the representation made by

the concerned workman Ext. W-2 the management by using a note specifically mentioned that as the service of the concerned workman was required at different places viz. A.C. Plant, D.G. Plant and other pieces he cannot be posted in the A.C. Plant alone as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic.

10. Considering all the facts and circumstances discussed above it is clear that in the year 1975 the concerned workman was appointed as Trainee Electrician. After completion of training his service was regularised as electrician and subsequently he got his promotion in Cat. V as electrician. There is sufficient reason to consider that work of electrician is widespread while the work of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic is limited. The note of the official of the management in the representation submitted by the concerned workman Ext. W-2 definitely will speak for the same. As the two jobs i.e., the job of electrician and the job of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic are quite different whether the concerned workman as a matter of right can claim changing his designation. If for arguments sake it is taken into consideration that the workmen who have been selected for the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic were deployed in inferior posts and junior to him is there any scope to say that for the said reason the concerned workman accrued his right to get his service regularised as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. No evidence is forthcoming that the post of electrician and the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic are same in category. The management trained the concerned workman as electrician. Naturally they expect service from him for his specialised job for which he got his appointment. As the workmen who according to him were junior to him and who have been selected for the post of A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic does not ipso facto accrues any right to place his claim in the said post.

11. Considering the facts and circumstances there is sufficient reason to believe that the concerned workman was temporarily posted in the A.C. Plant as Electrician as an additional hand to operate the A.C. Plant. During his deployment in the said plant he was never designated as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. After a short period he was withdrawn from the said plant and transferred back to his original department. Posting for such a short period definitely did not accrue any right to claim his regularisation in the said post. Until and unless it is established that nature of job of electrician and A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic are same in nature and the posts are also equal of status there is no scope to claim any particular post as of right particularly when he was not appointed for the same.

12. I hold that the sponsoring union in course of hearing have failed to substantiate the genuinity of the claim of the concerned workman. No evidence is

forthcoming that management illegally and arbitrarily victimised the concerned workmen without regularising his service as A.C. Plant Operator-cum-Mechanic. Accordingly, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief.

In the result, the following award is rendered :—

"The action of the management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., Koyla Bhawan, P.O. Koyla Nagar, Dist. Dhanbad in not designating Shri Krishna Nandan Prasad Yadav, as A.C. Plant Operator/Mechanic w.e.f. 27-7-82 with all benefits is justified. Consequently, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief."

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1661.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा० को०को०लि० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण II, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 7/1998) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/463/97-आई.आर (सी-1)]

एस.एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th May, 2003

S.O. 1661.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 7/1998) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-II Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-20012/463/97-IR (C-1)]

S.S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas,
Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10 (1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 7 OF 1998

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of Kusunda Area of M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman	:	Shri R. P. Shukla, Advocate.
On behalf of the employers	:	Shri D. K. Verma, Advocate.
State	:	Jharkhand
Industry	:	Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 30th April, 2003.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/463/97-I.R. (Coal-I), dated, the 9th January, 1998.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Kusunda Area of BCCL in not regularising Sri Ram Ratan Pd. Singh Fitter at Dhansar in the year 1985 with consequential promotional benefits based on cadre scheme thereafter and (2) in not promoting the workman even after the expiry of period of punishment of one year in 1992 are justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workman according to W.S. submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows :—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workman is a permanent employee under the management at Kusunda area and possessed ITI and N.C.V.T. certificate. They submitted that the management in the year 1985 authorised the concerned workman to work as Fitter and since then he is performing that duty to the full satisfaction of the management. Accordingly he ought to have been regularised in Cat. IV with effect from January, 1985 when he was engaged to perform the job of Fitter. They alleged that the management instead of regularising the concerned workman in Cat. IV in the year 1985 regularised him in the year 1987 and still he is working as Cat. IV worker. They alleged that the concerned workman was deprived of getting his promotion though he deserved to get his promotion in Cat. VI in the year 1988 and also was entitled to get further promotion in 1991.

3. Admitting the facts of issuance of chargesheet against the concerned workman and in consequence of stoppage of one increment as punishment the sponsoring union submitted that it could not be a bar to affect his further promotion but the management illegally, arbitrarily and violating the principle of natural justice has deprived him from his legitimate claim of promotion. They alleged that in view of the rigid decision taken by the management

they raised an Industrial Dispute before the ALC(C) Dhanbad which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for award. Accordingly, they submitted prayer to pass award holding that the action of the management in not regularising the concerned workman as Fitter at Dhansar in the year 1985 with consequential promotional benefit based on cadre scheme thereafter and in not promoting him after the expiry of the period of punishment for one year in 1992 are not justified and for which direction is to be given to the management to regularise him in Cat. IV with effect from 1985 and to give further promotion as per cadre scheme with back wages and other consequential relief.

4. To management on the contrary after filing W.S.-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the W.S. submitted on behalf of the workman. Management submitted that regularisation of a workman on any post depends on appraisal of his performance on such job for a period of three years. They submitted that the concerned workman was a Helper in Cat. II in the year 1985 and he was authorised to work as Fitter in the same year with a view to join his experience on elementary fitting jobs of the machineries for considering his promotion in the post of Fitter. They submitted that once any helper in Cat. II is found to be suitable to work as Fitter independently, he is regularised as Fitter in Cat. IV. They disclosed that as the performance of the concerned workman was found to be satisfactory he was regularised as Fitter in Cat. IV in the year 1987. They submitted that as per the cadre scheme formulated by JBCCI and circulated through Circular No. 30 dt. 26-6-84, the concerned workman was governed by the cadre scheme. As per the aforesaid cadre scheme a mechanical Fitter in Cat. IV with three years experience becomes eligible for consideration of his promotion in Mechanical Fitter Cat. V. after being recommended by D.P.C. and Trade test. The D.P.C. in recommending the case of any Workman for promotion consider the performance report for last five years and also assess his conduct. If the D.P.C. is satisfied with the appraisal of performance report and good conduct his case is recommended after adjudging his suitability in grade post.

5. They alleged that the concerned workman committed serious misconduct of assaulting his superior officer viz the Executive Engineer under whom he was working in the year 1990 and he was issued a chargesheet for commission of such misconduct and disciplinary action was initiated against him and he was found guilty. They submitted that inspite of dismissing him from service for committing such serious misconduct management held lenient view and stopped one increment only. They submitted that the conduct of the concerned workman for the period from 1987 to 1992 was highly unsatisfactory and his performance of job was not good and for which he could not be considered suitable for promotion to higher

post. As the concerned workman has failed to improve his conduct and performance on his job efficiently and diligently his case could not be considered by the D.P.C. for his promotion from Cat. IV to Cat. V by D.P.C. They submitted that the concerned workman can only be considered for his promotion after he will maintain good conduct for a period of five years and will prove his worth by sincerely working as per the advice and direction of the Engineers of the company. They categorically denied the fact that illegally and arbitrarily the promotion of the concerned workman has been withheld. Accordingly they submitted their prayer to pass award rejecting the claim of the concerned workman.

6. The points to be considered in this reference are:—

“Whether the action of the management of Kusunda Area of BCCL in not regularising Sri Ram-Ratan Pd. Singh Fitter at Dhansar in the year 1985 with consequential promotional benefits based on cadre scheme thereafter and (2) in not promoting the workman even after the expiry of period of punishment of one year in 1992 are justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

FINDING WITH REASONS

7. It appears from the record that the sponsoring union to substantiate the claim examined the concerned workman as witness in this case while the management did not adduce any evidence in support of his facts disclosed in the W.S.-cum-rejoinder submitted by them. However, considering the evidence of the workman and also considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides I find no dispute to hold that the concerned workman got his appointment as Fitter Helper on 29-12-81 in Cat. I. Thereafter he got his promotion in Cat. I on 29-12-82. It is admitted fact that the management authorised the concerned workman to work as Fitter with effect from 9-1-85 and his service was regularised as Fitter on 7-2-87 i.e. two years after performing duties of Fitter being authorised by the management. The contention of the concerned workman is that his regularisation of service as Fitter ought to have been done by the management after three months from the date of his authorisation as Fitter i.e. from 9-1-85. He alleged that as the management did not regularise his service as Fitter after three months of his being authorised to act as Fitter he sustained financial loss. Now the point for consideration is if the management committed any illegality in not regularising him as Fitter according to his claim.

8. The management in course of hearing submitted that whenever any helper is authorised to work as a Fitter he is giving the jobs of Fitter to gain his knowledge how to perform such job effectively. Thereafter when it is found that the said workman has attained his proficiency and is capable to carry on his job of Fittings the machineries

independently he is regularised as Fitter in Cat. V. The management submitted that in the instant case the concerned workman was regularised as Fitter Cat. V in the year 1987 after observing his performance and finding him suitable for his regularisation in Cat. V.

9. It is fact that authorisation to work as Fitter does not amount his promotion in the post of Fitter. Management in their W.S. have clarified this fact. The concerned during his evidence did not challenge this fact. Therefore authorisation to act as Fitter and Fitter should not be construed identically. Now the question is how long the workman will have to wait for his regularisation as Fitter in Cat. V. It is the submission of the concerned workman that as per standing order management is liable to regularise him as Fitter in Cat. V. after three months of his being deputed to work as Fitter. But in support of his claim the sponsoring Union have failed to produce any authentic paper. It should be borne into mind that the concerned workman was Helper in Cat. II before he was authorised to work as Fitter. The job of Fitter Helper cannot be equated with that of the job of Fitter. There is sufficient reason to believe that much proficiency is required to discharge the duties of Fitter than that of Fitter Helper. It is seen that departmentally Fitter Helper is given opportunity to get his promotion in the post of Fitter and for which the concerned workman was authorised to act as Fitter with a view to attain his proficiency so that his service could be regularised as Fitter in Cat. V. It is seen that management being satisfied with the ability and proficiency of the concerned workman regularised his service on 7-2-87. No evidence on the part of the concerned workman is forthcoming to the effect that inspite of attaining his proficiency within three months of his being authorised to act as Fitter the management neglected and refused to regularise him as Fitter in Cat. V. As the job of Fitter requires proficiency, I think such demand for regularisation of his service as Fitter in Cat. V after three months of his being authorised to work as Fitter cannot be accepted until and unless it is established that intentionally management refused to regularise him a Fitter in Cat. V inspite of his attaining proficiency. Accordingly, I do not find any scope to accept such contention of the workman that management did not illegally regularised him as Fitter in Cat. V in the year 1987.

10. Now the point for consideration is if the management intentionally withheld his further promotion in Cat. VI inspite of his performing duties as Cat. V Fitter 1987 to 1992. There is no dispute to hold that as per cadre scheme formulated by JBCCI and circulated through circular No. 30 dt. 26-6-84 promotion of Fitter to higher category is governed by the cadre scheme. There is also no dispute to hold that as per cadre scheme, a Mechanical Fitter in Cat. IV with three years of experience becomes eligible for consideration of his promotion to Mechanical Fitter in Cat. V after being recommended by the D.P.C. and Trade test.

Management submitted that the D.P.C. before recommending the name of the workman for his higher promotion not only consider his performance but also consider his conduct and behaviour for a period of past five years. They submitted that the concerned workman became eligible to appear before D.P.C. in the year 1990 after completion of his three years service as Fitter in Cat. V. They submitted that in the year 1990 the concerned workman was chargesheeted for committing serious misconduct for assaulting the Executive Engineer under whom he used to work. In course of enquiry he was found guilty and his one increment was stopped. The concerned workman in course of his evidence admitted this fact. Considering admission of the workman it is clear that his conduct and behaviour was not at all good though the D.P.C. consider it as an added qualification in the matter of recommending the name of any workman for higher promotion.

11. It is seen that the concerned workman was regularised as Fitter in Cat. IV in the year 1987. As per cadre scheme he was eligible to appear before D.P.C. on attaining the period of his eligibility. It is seen that the concerned workman completed three years of service in Cat. IV in the year 1990. Therefore he acquired his eligibility to appear before the D.P.C. for getting his higher promotion. It transpires that in the year 1990 he was chargesheeted by the management for committing serious misconduct on the ground of assaulting his superior officer and he was found guilty and in consequent to that finding his one increment was stopped. As the D.P.C. considers good conduct and behaviour of a workman apart from his performance and Trade test the name of the concerned workman was not recommended for his promotion to higher category. The offence which the concerned workman committed not only was serious in nature but also it had a bad signal in maintaining peace and harmony between the employer and employees. Such indiscipline act of the concerned workman cannot be indulged in any manner. Accordingly there is no reason to believe that the management committed any illegal act or took any arbitrary decision in refusing to give promotion to the concerned workman in higher category.

12. Simultaneously the question which has been cropped up here is whether for such act the concerned workman shall be deprived of getting any promotion during rest period of his service life. Management in their pleading admitted that though the concerned workman committed serious misconduct they took lenient view and instead of imposing him serious punishment his one increment was stopped. There is reason to believe that such lenient view was taken with a view to give opportunity to the concerned workman for his rectification in life so that he can create a healthy atmosphere to maintain peace and harmony in the industry. No evidence is forthcoming before this Tribunal that the concerned workman did not mend his behaviour after suffering his punishment. Holding lenient view and

imposing light punishment the intention of the management was to rectify him so that he could be converted as good and efficient workman. It is seen that management inspite of holding lenient view against the concerned workman did not give him the opportunity to give his promotion in higher grade inspite of suffering the punishment. Such attitude of the management has caused double jeopardy to the interest of the concerned workman which I consider is arbitrary and violative to the principles of natural justice.

13. In course of hearing argument the representative of the concerned workman submitted that after 1992 even the management refused to give him promotion to Cat. V inspite of recommendation made by the D.P.C. in his favour. If this fact is taken into consideration the management cannot avoid responsibility to assign its reason but they have failed to do so.

14. After careful consideration of all the facts and circumstances I hold that after suffering the punishment imposed on the concerned workman there is no reason to deprive him from giving promotion to Cat. V if his name has duly been recommended by the D.P.C. I, therefore, hold that claim of the concerned workman stands on cogent footing and he is entitled to get promotion to higher grade if his name has been recommended by the D.P.C.

In the result, the following Award is rendered :—

“The action of the management of Kusunda Area of BCCL in not regularising Sri Ram Ratan Pd. Singh, Fitter at Dhansar in the year 1985 with consequential promotion benefits based on cadre scheme is justified (2) in not promoting the workman even after expiry of the period of punishment of one year in 1992 is not justified. Consequently, the concerned workman is entitled to get promotion to higher grade after 1992 if his name has been recommended by the D. P. C.”

The management is directed to implement the Award within three months from the date of its publication in the Gazette of India in the light of the observations made above.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1662.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधतात्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकारण नं. II, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 17/1998) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/205/96-आई. आर.(सी-1)]

एस.एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th May, 2003

S.O. 1662.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 17/1998) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal II Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-20012/205/96-IR (C-1)]

S.S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. BISWAS,
Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 17 OF 1998

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None.

On behalf of the employers : Shri D. K. Verma,
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated Dhanbad, the 30th April, 2003

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/205/96-IR (Coal-I), dated, the 17th/20th February, 1998.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the union for the placement and designation of S/Shri M. K. Roy and four others as per annexure below is justified ? If so, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled to?”

ANNEXURE

1. Shri M. M. Roy

2. Shri M. Mahato

3. Shri R. V. Thakur

4. Shri B. Yadav

5. Shri D. N. Yadav

2. The case of the concerned workman according to the W.S. submitted by the sponsoring union on their behalf in brief is as follows :—

They submitted that out of the five concerned workmen Shri M.M. Roy, Sri M. Mahato, Sri R.V. Thakur, Shri B. Yadav and Sri D.N. Yadav are working as Foreman incharge since 1990, Foreman since 1982, Electrician since 1982, Electrician since 1982, Electrician since 1982 respectively under the management. Out of these five workmen Sri M. N. Roy, Foreman incharge, and Sri M. Mahato, Foreman possesses Supervisory licence of competency in Electrical Trade and the rest three workman possess Wieman's certificate in Electrical Trade. They submitted that as per nature of their work they should have been placed in their respective designation and scales of pay for the same from appropriate time and date as per demand of the union mentioned in their letter bearing BCMS/95/14 dt. 28/29-11-95 but the management deliberately failed to do so in violation of relevant Coal Wage Agreement and for which they raised an Industrial Dispute for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal. They submitted that Sri M. N. Roy by virtue of his working as Overall incharge of Electric Substation and also by virtue of possessing requisite qualifications viz. I.T.I. certificate in Electrical Trade with N.C.U.T. certificate is legally entitled for his placement in T&S Grade A as Foreman incharge from the date of issue of supervisory licence of competency in electrical trade as per directive of D.G.M.S. Sri M. Mahato who is working under Sri M. N. Roy also in view of his possessing the aforesaid qualification is legally entitled for his placement in T&S Grade A with designation of Foreman. He is so entitled as per direction issued by D.G.M.S. which provides that workman possessing supervisory licence of competency in Electrical Trade is to be placed in T&S Grade-A from the date of the issue of the said licence to him. While the other three workmen by virtue of their posessing Wieman's certificate of competency in Electrical Trade along with possession of ITI certificate with N.C.U.T. certificate are legally entitled for their placement as Asstt. Foreman in T&S Grade-C after one year of 1982 as they were authorised to work on overhead line of 33/kV from 1982. They alleged that the actions of the management in not placing Sri M. N. Roy with designation as Foreman incharge in T&S Grade-A from the date of issue of Supervisory licence of competency in electrical trade issued to him, in not placing Sri M. Mahato with designation as Foreman in T&S Grade-A from the date of issue of supervisory licence and competency in Electrical trade to him and in not placing the other three workmen T&S Grade-C with designation as Asstt.

Foreman are arbitrary and unjustified being violating of the directive of D.G.M.S. and other laws.

3. Management on the contrary after filing W.S.-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the W.S. submitted on behalf of the concerned workman.

They submitted that workman Shri M. M. Roy, was appointed on 3-10-1963 at Madhuban colliery while it was under control of the private management. After taking over the colliery by the present management he was posted at Diesel Generating Plant as Electrician in Sept., 1980. In the year 1980 he got his promotion as Assistant Foreman Grade-C. Thereafter with effect from 11-5-1988 he was given the scope to act as Foreman. Considering his performance and thereafter he was regularised as Foreman in Grade-B with effect from Sept., 1989. Even the management paid him the difference of wages between Grade B and Grade C for the period from 11-5-1988 till the date of his regularisation by order dt. 7-9-1989.

4. They submitted that the said workman did not possess Electrical Supervisorship certificate and he was a non-matric without having any Trade Certificate like I.T.I. In spite of lacking of requisite qualification he demanded for his promotion to the post of Foreman incharge/Electrical in Gr. A. They submitted that as per cadre scheme no workman can be placed as Asstt. Foreman, Foreman or Foreman incharge in the electrical cadre unless he holds the Electrical Supervisorship certificate as per the provisions of Indian Electricity Rules. However, considering his length of experience and his seniority, he was given Grade-C and Grade-B as a special case to show him special favour. Disclosing this fact they submitted that there is no scope to accede to the claim of this workman in absence of his requisite qualification for getting his promotion in Grade-A according to the provision of Cadre scheme.

5. They submitted that the workman M. Mahato was taken on the roll of the company as General mazdoor on 1-4-1972 and he was posted at Diesel Generating Plant, Madhuban in 1976 to work as Electrical helper and was promoted in Cat. II from Cat. I. He was given the scope of electrician with effect from 1-8-1979 and he was put in Cat. IV. He was promoted to Cat. V with effect from 2-9-1985. He was given the scope of electrician with effect from 1-8-1979 and he was put in Cat. IV. He was promoted to Cat. V with effect from 2-9-1985. He was given the job of special types with effect from 21-10-1986 and after observing his satisfactory performance he was regularised in Cat. VI by office order dt. 16-1-1990. Thereafter, he was deputed to work as charge man/Asstt. Foreman according to requirement under the supervision of the Foreman incharge (Electrical) or under the supervision of the Engineer and was paid the difference of wages for the acting period between Grade 'C' and Cat. VI. They submitted that as he

did not possess the supervisor's certificate under the provision of Indian Electricity Rules, he could not be entrusted to perform the job of Asstt. Foreman (Electrical) independently. He obtained the above certificate in the year 1993 and he was regularised as Chargemen/Asstt. Foreman in Grade 'C' by order dt. 16-10-1993. They disclosed that the claim of the concerned workman to get his promotion in Grade 'B' and designation as Foreman without any justification. His case for promotion will be considered along with others at the appropriate time.

6. They disclosed that R. V. Yadav was appointed as Helper (T) in Cat. I on 24-11-1982 in Electrical Trade. He was regularised in Electrical Helper in Cat. II on 20-11-1983. In the year 1989 said Yadav obtained the Wireman's certificate and he was regularised as Electrician in Cat. IV. Subsequently he was promoted to Cat. V. They submitted that his claim for promotion in Cat. VI could not be considered as he has not passed his Wireman's certificate with regard to High Tension Circuit. They submitted further that in the Schedule of Reference the name of R. V. Thakur has been mentioned. They disclosed that there is no such person in the establishment and for which the case of R. V. Yadav is not maintainable. They submitted that the case of workman B. Yadav stands on the same footing with workman R. V. Yadav. His promotion in Cat. VI could not be considered as he could not pass Wireman's certificate with regard to high tension circuit and for which the demand placed by this workman is not maintainable at all. In relation to the claim of D. N. Yadav they submitted that he was appointed as Apprentice in Electrical Trade on 20-9-1982 and was regularised as Electrical Helper in Cat. II with effect from 28-8-1985 after completion of Apprenticeship period. Thereafter time to time he got his promotion and in the month of Dec. 1990 he got his promotion in Cat. V. In the year 1993 he obtained H.T. permit and was promoted to Cat. VI w.e.f. 5-8-1995 on the basis of recommendation made by D.M. They submitted that the claim of this workman to get his promotion in Grade 'C' finds no basis because of the fact that he has not got passed Electrical Supervisory Certificate.

7. They submitted that the management gave all the workmen scope for their promotion and career growth and there is no justification for any person to have any grievance against the management. They alleged that the sponsoring union was misled and have filed the present case with unreasonable claim due to lack of proper knowledge and the nature of duties performed by the concerned workmen and the cadre scheme applicable to them.

Accordingly, they submitted prayer for passing Award rejecting the claim of the concerned workmen.

8. The points to be decided in this reference are:—

"Whether the demand of the union for the placement and designation of S/Shri M. K. Roy and four others

as per annexure below is justified ? If so, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled to?"

ANNEXURE

1. Shri M. M. Roy
2. Shri M. Mahato
3. Shri R. V. Thakur.
4. Shri B. Yadav
5. Shri D. N. Yadav.

FINDING WITH REASONS

9. It transpires from the record that the sponsoring Union in order to substantiate their claim did not consider necessary to adduce any evidence either documentary or oral. Obviously the management declined to adduce any evidence on their part as initial onus to justify the claim in question rested with the sponsoring union.

10. Considering the pleadings of both sides I find no dispute to hold that concerned workmen M.M. Roy, M. Mahato, R. V. Yadav, B. Yadav and D. N. Yadav discharging their duties as Foreman, Asstt, Foreman, Electrician in Cat. VI respectively.

11. The demand of the sponsoring union is for promotion of M.M. Roy as Foreman incharge (Electrical) Grade-A from the date of issue of supervisory licence of competency in Electrical Trades, for promotion of M. Mahato with designation as Foreman in Grade-B from the date of issues of supervisory licence of competency in Electrical grade, for promotion of other three workman as Asstt. Foreman in Grade-C. In support of such claim it has been mentioned by the sponsoring union that M. M. Roy not only has obtained ITI certificate in Electrical with N.C.V.T. certificate but also has obtained supervisory licence of competency in Electrical trade as per directive of D.G.M.S. They submitted that another workman M. Mahato also has obtained all the certificates which Mr. M.M. Roy holds. In respect of the other three workmen they submitted that those workmen have already obtained Wireman's certificate of competency in Electrical Trade with the qualifications of possessing ITI certificate with N.C.V.T. Certificate and for which they are legally entitled for their placement as Foreman in Grade-C after one year of 1982 as they were authorised to work on overhead line of 33/11 KV from 1982.

12. On the contrary from the submission of as the management I find a different picture. They disclosed that Mr. M.M. Roy, though is discharging his duties as Foreman Grade B is a non-matriculate. Apart from his academic qualification he also neither possessed supervisorship certificate nor I.T.I. certificate. They submitted that as per the cadre scheme no workman can be placed as Foreman

incharge Grade-A in the electrical cadre. Unless he holds the Electrical Supervisership certificate as per the provision of Indian Electricity Rules. Accordingly there was no scope on their part to accede to the demand of the workman in the matter of his promotion as Foreman incharge (Electrical) Grade-A. The management submitted that the claim of Mr. M. Mahato another workman stands in the same footing with that of M.M. Roy. As this workman has not obtained supervisorship certificate there is no scope to consider his promotion as Foreman Grade-A from his present designation as Asstt. Foreman.

13. They submitted that both R. V. Yadav and B. Yadav are now discharging their duties as electrician in Cat. V. as they have obtained Wireman's certificate. However, Question of accedings to their promotion as Electrician in Cat. VI did not arise on the ground that they have failed to produce Wireman's certificate with regard to high tension circuit.

14. In case of another workman i.e. D. N. Yadav the sponsoring union have claimed his promotion to the post of Asstt. Foreman Electrical in Grade 'C' from Cat. VI. In this regard the management submitted that though this workman has obtained Wireman's certificate with regard to high tension circuit has not yet passed the Electrical Supervisorship certificate and for which there was no scope to consider his promotion as Asstt. Foreman (Electrical).

15. Therefore, considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides it transpires that claim of the concerned workman for regularisation of their services in higher post depends on fulfilment of certain conditions viz. production of supervisorship certificate and Wireman's certificate with regard to high tension circuit. The first particulars i.e. Supervisorship certificate while required in case of M. M. Roy and M. Mahato the second particulars are required in case of other workmen apart from academic qualification. It is the specific submission of the management that claim of M.M. Roy could not be considered as he was non-matric and also as he has failed to obtain supervisorship certificate. In case of M. Mahato the claim of the management is that he has also failed to obtain the same certificate. Similarly in case of the claim of R. V. Yadav and B. Yadav production of Wireman's certificate with regard to high tension circuit was very much needed but as they failed to produce the same they could not be considered fit for promotion. In case of the claim of D.N. Yadav, the management submitted that though he obtained the requisite certificate, as per cadre scheme he is not eligible for consideration of his promotion to the post of Assistant Foreman Electrical in Grade 'C' from Cat. VI.

16. To rebut the claim of the management initial onus rested with the sponsoring union. The specific claim of the sponsoring union is that the management arbitrarily

denied to consider promotion of the concerned workman inspite of fulfilment of requisite qualification. It is astonishing to note that inspite of getting ample opportunities the sponsoring union neither adduced any evidence nor produced the relevant certificates which are to be considered as pre-condition for getting promotion to the respective post. Claim on the part of the sponsoring union that the management refused to give promotion to the concerned workmen inspite of attaining their eligibility gets no force until and unless such claim is substantiated by cogent evidence. It is settled principle of law that facts disclosed in the W.S. cannot be taken into consideration until and unless it is supported by consent evidence. I find no hesitation to say that the sponsoring union inspite of getting ample opportunities have misused the same. I do not find any reason to deny the claim of the concerned workmen but to get force of the same the sponsoring union cannot avoid their responsibility to establish the same. I find no hesitation to say that the sponsoring union have lamentably failed to establish the claim of the concerned workman and for which they are not entitled to get any relief according to the prayer in question.

In the result, the following Award is rendered :—
“The demand of the union for the placement and designation of S/Shri M.M. Roy and four others as per annexure is not justified. Consequently, the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief.”

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1663.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को. लि. के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. I, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 34/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/214/99-आई. आर.(सी-1)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th May, 2003

S.O. 1663.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 34/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-I, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-20012/214/99-IR(C-1)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I,
DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference U/S.10(1)(d)(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 34 of 2000.

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of C.V. Area of M/s.B.C.C.Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT : Shri S.H. Kazmi,
Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri B.M. Prasad, Advocate

For the Union/Workmen: Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary,
Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union
alongwith Shri K. Chakravarty

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 29th April, 2003.

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/214/99-I.R.(C-I) dated 14-1-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of BCCL C.V. Area in not regularising Shri Bhola Poddar in the post of Clerk though he has been performing the job of Clerk since 20-2-95 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. Precisely, the case of the sponsoring union is that the concerned workman, Bhola Poddar, has been performing the job of Engineering Clerk since 1995 as per direction and authorisation of the management and he has already put in the attendance of more than 240 days in each calendar year to the satisfaction of the management. It has been said that as per the direction of the management the concerned workman has been maintaining the documents of SDL maintenance performance, daily performance report, plant and machinery utilisation and performance report, SDL Log Book maintenance showing details of SDL working hours idleness, period of break down etc. Further he has

been maintaining gate pass, work order, Sunday, holiday man power list, record of plant and machinery. Further it has been said that though the management has implemented the Wage Board Recommendations and NCWAs but even then the management neither regularised the concerned workman in clerical cadre nor paying the concerned workman wages of a clerk despite several representations submitted for regularisation and for paying proper wages of at least Clerical Grade-II. Further the case is that when no response was made from the side of the management, the union on behalf of the concerned workman raised the industrial dispute and since due to adamant attitude of the management the conciliation proceeding ended in failure, ultimately, the dispute was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Lastly the statement has been made that the action of the management in not regularising the concerned workman as Clerk and not paying him the wages of a clerk was illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the principle of natural justice. The relief has been sought for directing the management to regularise the concerned workman as Clerk and to pay him at least Clerical Grade-II wages with all arrear of wages and consequential benefits.

3. The management's case, on the other hand, in short, is that the concerned workman was appointed as Fitter Helper (Trainee) in Category-I w.e.f. 13-12-89 and was subsequently regularised as Fitter Helper in Category-II w.e.f. 8-11-90. He holds the substantive post of Fitter Helper in Category-II and is continuing to work on such post. It has been said that as per JBCCI circular whenever any vacancy will occur in the clerical cadre, the internal candidates eligible for such post possessing necessary qualification and experience, may be given opportunity to apply for such post. A Selection Committee is constituted for selection of the candidates for filling up of permanent vacancy and on the basis of recommendations of the Selection Committee, the persons are selected and appointed in clerical cadre. It is further said that no officer has been empowered to follow pick and choose method and change the cadre of a time-rated or piece-rated worker in the clerical cadre at the request of any union leader or at the instance of some other person. It has further been said that the management has issued circular putting ban on the conversion of time-rated and piece-rated workers into clerical cadre. The local management is required to notify vacancies in clerical cadre with their proposal for filling up the same and only after due approval from the headquarter such persons can be changed into clerical cadre. It is also said that any unauthorised act done by any officer at the local level cannot give any right to a workman for change of his cadre from time-rated category to clerical cadre by adopting undue influence, corruption or mal practices. Further the case is that the

concerned workman with the help of sponsoring union fabricated certain documents with the connivance of certain interested persons and have made out the present case for conversion of the time-rated worker into the clerical cadre with the help of litigation by circumventing the provisions of cadre scheme as well as company's instructions. The demand of the concerned workman for regularisation in clerical cadre, as such, cannot be accepted. It is also said that the concerned workman was never authorised by the competent cadre controlling authority changing his cadre from time-rated category to clerical cadre. He was also never authorised by any competent officer incharge of cadre control for working as clerk on any specified post. Further it is said that no such sanctioned post existed nor the concerned workman was deputed to work on any engineering job; on the other hand, he was working as helper which was his prescribed job attached to his designation. The demand of the sponsoring union, as such, has been described as baseless or unfounded.

In its rejoinder also apart from denying or controverting several statement made in the written statement of the workman, the management has categorically denied the performance of job of engineering clerk by the workman since 1995 and his completion of 240 days attendance in each calendar year. It has also been denied that the concerned workman is maintaining documents like SDL, machines or writing reports relating to performance of plants and machineries etc.

In the rejoinder to the written statement of the management also several statements made therein have been denied or controverted and on behalf of the workman it has been reiterated that though the concerned workman was appointed as Cat.I mazdoor and subsequently regularised as Cat. II but as per direction and authorisation of the management he has been working as clerk since 1995 till date continuously and has put in more than 240 days attendance in each calendar year. The statement as regards fabrication of certain documents with connivance with certain interested persons has also been emphatically denied. Non-existence of any sanctioned post as averred on behalf of the management has also been described as false and incorrect.

4. From the stands taken on behalf of the respective sides, as seen above, it is apparent that the moot question involved that requires consideration for the disposal of the instant case is whether on the basis of the materials produced the concerned workman can be taken to have performed the jobs of a clerk under the direction or authorisation of any authority of the management continuously since the year 1995 or not and

also whether in that process he has already put in the attendance or 240 days in one calendar year or no so as to claim the regularisation on the said job under the management.

5. In support of their respective stands both the sides have led their oral as well as documentary evidence. One witness was examined on behalf of the management and likewise one witness was examined on behalf of the workman. The documents filed on behalf of the workman are marked Exts.W-1 to W-13 and the sole document filed on behalf of the management is marked Ext.M-1. Relevancy or significance of all those materials produced would be taken note of and considered in course of the discussions made hereinafter.

6. As it is evident, the definite stand of the workman is that though initially he was appointed as Fitter Helper (Trainee) in Category-I and then subsequently was regularised as Fitter Helper in Cat. II but since the year 1995 under the direction and authorisation of the management he has been continuously working as a clerk and in that capacity each year he has already put in the attendance of more than 240 days.

The definite stand of the management, on the other hand, is that the workman was appointed as Fitter Helper (Trainee) in Category-I and then was regularised as Fitter Helper in Category-II w.e.f. 8-11-90 and since then he went on working in that capacity although and never worked or has never been working or has never been assigned the work of a clerk at any point of time. Further its stand is that since the concerned workman never worked as a clerk no question arises of his putting in 240 days attendance in each calendar year.

Quite obviously there is complete denial from the side of the management so far as performance of job of a clerk by the workman is concerned. In this view of the matter firstly it is required to be seen as to how far the management's such stand can be taken to the correct. The question of compiotion of 240 days working as clerk each year or in one calendar year would come only the next.

7. Not only in the written statement rather in his evidence also the concerned workman has given the details of nature of work performed by him as a clerk posted in Engineering Section during the aforesaid period or since 1995. He has stated about authorisation also given from the side of the management for the discharge of those nature of works. Document showing authorisation is marked Ext.W-11.

This document is dated 20-2-1999 under the signature of the Project Officer, Dhaibari Colliery. As

per the contents of the same considering the qualification as well as requirement of a clerk in the Engineering Section to maintain records and other documents the concerned workman was directed to works as Engineer's clerk and that arrangement was made on temporary basis.

Apart from the statement made in that regard in the written statement the concerned workman in his evidence also as WW-1 has stated that being a clerk posted in Engineering Section several documents are required to be maintained by him and those are SDL performance report, daily SDL performance report, plant and machinery utilisation of performance report, SDL log book maintenance details, working hours, idle hours, maintenance hours and break down hours. Besides the maintenance of those records, according to him, his work is also to maintain the gate pass, work order, Sunday approval, holiday approval, manpower list, O.T. hours and plant and machinery registers maintenance. He has said thereafter that entire works which relate to Engineering Section are being performed by him and all those works are the works of daily nature and are required to be performed every day. He has also stated that none else besides him performs the clerical works as mentioned above. His consistent stand is that from 1995 continuously he has been performing the job in the aforesaid capacity and still he is performing the same nature of jobs. In support of the aforesaid statement several documents have been filed on behalf of the workman. Out of those Ext. W-1 is a letter dated 2-6-98 addressed to the Project Officer by the Engineer of the concerned colliery and in that it has been acknowledged that the Project Officer had allowed the concerned workman to work as a Clerk in Engineering Section and thereafter he continued with the said job. The genuineness of this document is not in dispute as the management's witness during his evidence has identified and proved the signature of the said authority, namely, the Engineer. Ext. W-2 is a letter dated 3-6-98 addressed to the General Manager, Chanch/Victoria Area by the then Agent of Dahibari Colliery. It contains the mentioning of authorisation letter issued by the then Agent of Dahibari Colliery and further it speaks that the Engineer had confirmed in writing that the concerned workman performed the job of clerk. Ext. W-3 is photo copy of daily performance SDL report covering the period from 9-9-96 to 11-7-2000 containing 11 sheets over which the signature of the concerned workman is there and the same also bear the signatures of Superintending Engineer, Agent and the Manager. Ext. W-4 is monthly plant and machinery report containing 9 sheets which was prepared by the concerned workman and which is also said to have contained the signature of the

Superintending Engineer, it covers the period from 3-7-97 to 2-2-2000. Ext. W-5 is copies of two gate passes dated 20-2-97 and 15-7-95 duly signed by the concerned workman and which is also said to have contained the signature of the Superintending Engineer and Agent. Ext. W-6 are photo copies of work orders containing 10 sheet, covering the period from 20-3-95 to 25-3-2000 and over which besides the signature of the concerned workman the signatures of the Superintending Engineer, Agent and Manager are also there. Ext. W-7 is the Sunday approval list consisting of 13 sheets for the period from 2-10-97 to 16-7-2000 over which besides the signature of the concerned workman the signatures of the Superintending Engineer and Agent are also said to be there. Ext. W-8 is holiday approval list for the period from 2-10-97 to 20-3-2000 which is again prepared by the concerned workman and which bears his signature also and the same is also said to have contained the signatures of the Superintending Engineer and Agent of the colliery. Ext. W-9 is O.T. list containing 9 sheets for the period from 17-12-98 to 15-7-2000 prepared by the concerned workman and the same also said to bear the signatures of the Superintending Engineer and Agent of the colliery. Ext. W-10 is the letter dated 13-1-98 addressed to the Agent of the colliery by the General Manager and it mentions about the working of the concerned workman as a clerk in the Engineering Section of the colliery though he was designated as Fitter Helper. Ext. W-12 is the letter dated 18-6-98 sent to the colliery Engineer by the Manager of the colliery and this is as regards the maintenance of status-quo with respect to functioning of the concerned workman as clerk. The last document Ext. W-13 is the letter dated 29-5-98 addressed to the colliery Engineer by the Manager of the concerned colliery and this is regarding confirmation of the fact that the concerned workman was working as Clerk in Engineering Section. By way of this letter direction was made not to allow the concerned workman to work as Clerk. From Ext. W-12 it appears that this is the same letter which was ordered to be kept in abeyance till further order and direction was made for maintenance of status-quo.

It is evident from all the aforesaid documents that, in fact, the concerned workman, having been duly authorised by the Agent of the colliery, continuously worked as a clerk in Engineering Section and from time to time different authorities of the management acknowledged the fact regarding continuous working of the workman as clerk. Those documents further show the different nature of works performed by the concerned workman as a clerk posted in Engineering Section. Those documents further amply show that after 1995 not just for few months or few years rather even till date the

concerned workman has been performing the jobs of a clerk. Some of the documents, as seen above, are even of the year 2000. From Ext. W-10 it appears that having noticed that the concerned workman had been working as a clerk, the General Manager on 13-1-98 directed the Agent of the colliery to stop him from doing clerical job. In accordance with such direction it appears from Ext. W-13 that direction was made to the colliery Engineer by the Manager of the colliery for not allowing the concerned workman to work as clerk, but thereafter from the letter dated 18-6-98 contained in Ext. W-12 it is evident that the aforesaid letter (Ext. W-13) was ordered to be kept in abeyance till further orders and the direction of the superior authority of the management was conveyed regarding maintenance of status-quo in respect of the working of the concerned workman as a clerk. From such development also it becomes clear that the concerned workman even after 1998 went on working as a clerk as before.

As against the aforesaid documents in the written statement of the management the statement has been made that the workman has fabricated certain documents with his sponsoring union and with the connivance of certain interested persons and has made out the present case for conversion of the time-rated worker into the clerical cadre with the help of litigation by circumventing the provisions of cadre scheme as well as company's instructions. Suggestion has been made to WW-1 that those documents have been procured in collusion with some interested persons. There is no suggestion to the effect that those documents are forged, fabricated or manufactured. Significantly during pendency of the present proceeding the workman wanted the management to produce the originals of all those documents but despite the order passed by the Tribunal in that regard the management did not produce the same and no explanation was furnished much less the reasonable or acceptable explanation as to why those documents which can reasonably be expected to be in the possession of the management cannot be produced. The management's witness (MW-1) upon the question being asked during cross-examination has clearly said that all those documents are supposed to be available in the Engineering Section of the concerned colliery and then has said that if those documents which were called for would have been produced out of the same it could have appeared as to who was maintaining those documents in the Engineering Section of the concerned colliery. The concerned workman (WW-1) during his cross-examination has given the names of those authorities also from whom he had obtained the copies of those documents. If at all the management was serious in challenging the genuineness of those documents then it

could have examined any of those authorities also who in that event would have either accepted or denied the aforesaid statement of the workman.

In view of the aforesaid conduct on the part of the management, namely non-production of called for original documents, this argument made on behalf of the workman bears substance that adverse inference should be drawn against the management for withholding the aforesaid material documents. Those documents filed on behalf of the workmen are certainly very important documents which have got direct bearing so far the present case is concerned and as such those cannot be overlooked or brushed aside merely on the basis of unsubstantiated plea of the management that those are procured one.

Management's witness has tried to support the management's stand by saying that the concerned workman never worked as a clerk, but during his cross examination he has made it clear that an Engineer is overall incharge of engineering section of the concerned colliery and about himself he has said that it is not his job to supervise the job of Engineering Section. He has also expressed his ignorance by saying that he does not know whether the aforesaid documents are maintained in the Engineering Section by the clerk or not. At another place he has said that it is not within the knowledge of the Personnel Department of the colliery that the concerned workman was employed as a clerk in Engineering section against the permanent post. From these statements, As such, it is apparent that the aforesaid statement of this witness does not bear much significance and a competent witness for the present purpose would have been that authority who was posted in the Engineering Section itself being designated as Engineer or with any other designation.

In the face of overwhelming documents, as noticed above, it is difficult to accept the stand of the management that the concerned workman never worked as a clerk, rather continuously went on working as Fitter Helper in category-II on the contrary on the basis of all those materials it could well be found that the concerned workman under authorisation and direction of higher and competent authority of the management, has been working as a clerk continuously since 1995 and has been discharging all those duties or works which are supposed to be performed by a clerk deputed or posted in the Engineering section of the colliery.

8. The argument on behalf of the management is that merely on the basis of authorisation given by an authority who was not competent in that regard no right accrues to the workman for being regularised as clerk

specially when there is a circular of the year 1996 wherein clearly it was laid down that piece-rated and time-rated workers can be converted into monthly rated only with the written permission of the Director (Personnel). This document has been produced on behalf of the management and is marked Ext. M-1. Besides the above it has also been urged that no direct recruitment on clerical post as per cadre scheme can be made and further the promotion in clerical grade-II and grade-I is always done through D.P.C as per the said scheme and there was no question of taking the work of clerk in violation of such scheme.

9. It is well known that in a colliery, a project officer or the Agent of the colliery, as per standing orders is considered to be a competent authority responsible for day to day work. The management's witness (MW-1) has also accepted this fact by saying in his evidence that it is true that the Project officer is overall incharge of the entire colliery including Engineering Section of the colliery. He thereafter has said that an employee working in the colliery is bound to follow the instruction and direction of the Project Officer and the Engineer of Engineering Section. Thus, quite naturally when such an officer directed the concerned workman to do a particular nature of job then he was supposed to follow the direction and any denial or refusal on his part would have exposed him to serious consequence. It cannot be said that the workman had been working as a clerk on his own accord rather it is apparent that he had been working under the direction or authorisation of the project officer or the Agent of the colliery. It has been stated from the side of the management that he had no authority to take work of a clerk from a workman working in different post of lower grade, but no any such rule or provision has been cited to show that if not the Project Officer then in fact, who is that authority competent for the said purpose. It is true that one document (Ext. M-1) has been produced to show that for diversion to P.R. and T.R. can be done only with express written permission of the Director (Personnel) only, but it is evident that this document came into existence in the year 1996 whereas the concerned workman has already been working as a clerk since 20-2-95 itself and even after coming into existence of such circular or letter and despite the order or direction as contained in Ext. W-10 the management went on taking the jobs of a clerk from the concerned workman and nothing has been produced from the side of the management in denial of the fact regarding continuance of the workman as a clerk till date rather it is reiterated that some direction was made in the year 1998 for not taking the work of a clerk from the concerned workman but thereafter earlier direction was ordered to

be kept in abeyance and direction was made for maintenance of status-quo. Despite all such development which are borne out of the aforesaid documents, in a very strange manner the management has come out with the plea that the concerned workman never worked as a clerk.

It is also worthwhile to indicated that though much emphasis has been made upon the cadre scheme but no copy of such scheme has been filed or cited during arguments in support of the stand being taken. Assuming the existence of such cadre scheme here it has to be kept in mind that neither it is a case of direct recruitment as a clerk nor it is a case of promotion, rather it is simply a case of regularisation of a person on a post on which he has been working for years together not on his own rather under the direction of higher officials of the management responsible for the smooth functioning of the colliery or the project irrespective of his competence or authority to take work of a higher grade from a workman. From the stand taken either in the written statement of the management or in evidence it is apparent that the management is taking this case as a case of either direct recruitment or the promotion otherwise it would not have taken help of all the aforesaid provisions of cadre scheme which are all meant only for the aforesaid two purposes. Such approach of the management, on the very face or it is quite misplaced. In a case reported in AIR 1994 (SC) 1683 the demand of the workman who was officiating in a higher grade was for classification as permanent or temporary or rendering of continuous service in higher grade. The Industrial Tribunal was of the view that such a demand was for promotion which is managerial function and beyond the reach of adjudication. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the Tribunal mis-Interpreted the demand was for promotion. It further held that the demand to confirm an employee employed in an acting position in a grade would unquestionably be an industrial dispute. It would also be apt to take note of a decision of Hon'ble Patna High Court reported in 1994 (I) PLJR 377 wherein a workman claimed regularisation on the basis of having worked for 240 days or more in a year. While interpreting the term "regularisation" the Hon'ble Court held that term "regularisation" means to make "regular" which implies that the action was irregular and the same is being cured. Further the Hon'ble Court held that the word "regular" or "regularisation" are terms calculated to condone any procedural irregularity and are meant to cure defects and by regularising in appointment the procedural or any other irregularity is condoned for equitable reason. Here in the instant case even if at all the action of the management or the management's authorities in taking the job of a clerk from the concerned

workman, who was designated as Fitter Helper Category-II, was irregular then that irregularity, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, can well be condoned for equitable reason in the shape of regularising the concerned workman on the said job on which he has been working for a considerable long period.

10. It is obvious that despite having been designated as Fitter Helper Category-II right from the year 1995 the work of a clerk was taken from the concerned workman continuously but when he started claiming regularisation the management took a rigid stand and in order to justify its action came out with several pleas or defence mainly related to technical aspect, such as, authority, competence, cadre scheme etc. Though overwhelming documents were staring at its face, but it has even gone to the extent of denying the fact altogether, as seen above, that the concerned workman worked as a clerk during the relevant period. Certainly it is a glaring instance of exploitation of the labour force and indeed the conduct and attitude of the management come within the purview and ambit of the term 'unfair labour practice.' Much belatedly after taking the work from the concerned workman for years together the management cannot get away by taking shelter behind several technicalities highlighted in course of arguments. It is difficult to conceive that the management was not aware of the fact regarding the working of the workman as a clerk for a continuous long period of more than five years. Rather from some of the aforesaid documents it is clear that the management was well aware of the said fact. The concerned workman could have been easily reverted back much earlier. I am constrained to observe that the management knowingly/deliberately had been taking the work of a clerk from the concerned workman w.e.f. 1995 and no fault in that regard can be attributed to the concerned workman as he being a workman of much lower rank could not have been expected to go against the directive of the authorities of much higher rank of the management. He simply on the basis of his continuous working on a higher grade requested for regularisation on the said job which was not acceded to.

11. Half heartedly this submission also has been made on behalf of the management that there is no vacancy of a clerk in existence and as such it is not possible to regularise or absorb the concerned workman on the said post. The concerned workman in his evidence has emphatically denied the said fact. Nothing has been produced on behalf of the management in support of the aforesaid stand and its witness (MW-1) has clearly stated in his cross-examination that no any document has been produced to show the requirement and the strength of the workers in the concerned area. This apart, the

continuance of the concerned workman as a clerk since the year 1995 is itself sufficient to indicate the need and requirement of a clerk in the colliery or in the concerned section of the colliery.

12. In view of all the aforesaid, the concerned workman certainly deserves to be regularised as a clerk either for discharging the same duties which he has been discharging so far or in any other clerical job of Grade-III. Only in the written statement of the workman the relief has been sought for his regularisation as a Clerk in Grade-II but neither in the order of reference there is any mention about the said clerical grade nor during evidence any statement has been made as to why placing has been sought for in Grade-II. It is well known that for a clerical cadre the initial grade is Grade-III and thereafter for promotion from Clerical Grade-III to Grade-II and then from Grade-II to Grade-I, there is provision for holding D.P.C. as per cadre scheme and admittedly seniority is the only criteria for promotion to the aforesaid higher grade. The concerned workman is a graduate, as it has come in evidence, and this apart he has got sufficient experience also in the service of the management. As such, clerical Grade-III is the appropriate grade for the concerned workman even as per his own showing, his promotion to the higher grade would be subject to the prescribed rules or provisions under the Cadre Scheme of the management.

Thus, in view of all the discussions made hereinabove on the basis of materials on record, it is finally concluded that having worked as a clerk continuously for years together or for more than 240 days in one calendar year, the concerned workman deserves to be regularised in a clerical cadre and to avail all the benefits which are being availed by a regular workman of the same grade.

13. The award is, thus, made as hereunder :

The action of the management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. C.V. Area, in not regularising the concerned workman, Bhola Poddar, in the post of Clerk is not justified and the concerned workman, as such, deserves to be regularised as a Clerk Grade-III and it would be open for the management either to take same nature of work from the concerned workman which he has been performing since long or any other work of the same clerical grade. Consequently the management is hereby directed to act accordingly within sixty days from the date of publication of the award.

In the circumstances of the case, however, there would be no order as to cost.

S. H. KAZMI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1664.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार विजया बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं.-2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संखा 264/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-05-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/2/1999-आई. आर. (बी. II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st May, 2003

S.O. 1664.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. 264/99 of the Central Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 2 as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Vijaya Bank, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 21-05-2003.

[No. L-12011/2/1999-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT

SHRI B. BISWAS,

Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 264 OF 1999

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of Vijaya Bank, Calcutta and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Shri Krishna M. Shetty,
Sr. Branch Manager.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Banking.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 6th May, 2003.

ORDER

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-12011/2/99/IR(B-II), dated, the 14th June, 1999.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Vijaya Bank in calling only six senior Clerks for interview to fill the vacancy of three Special Assistants including one at Ranchi and not filling up the post of Special Assistant at Ranchi through a separate notification is justified ? If not, what relief the workman are entitled ??”

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor their representative appeared. However, the management side though appeared before this Tribunal did not file authorisation and W.S. It is seen from the record that the instant reference was received by this Tribunal on 28-6-99 and since then it is pending for disposal. As the concerned workman failed to appear, registered notices were issued to the workman side but inspite of issuance of notices they failed to appear before this Tribunal. They also did not even respond to the notices issued by this Tribunal. In natural course the question will arise what will be the fate of the reference made by the Ministry for its disposal. The reference is made on the basis of dispute raised by the concerned workman/union. Naturally responsibility rests with concerned workman/union to assist the Court to dispose of the reference in issue on merit. In view of the decision of the Hon’ble Apex Court reported in 2002(94) FLR 624 it will not be just and proper to pass ‘No dispute’ Award when both parties remain absent. There is also no scope to answer the reference on merit in absence of any W.S. and available documents. There is no dispute to hold that when any reference is made it is expected to be disposed of on merit but when the parties do not take any step or do not consider even to file W.S./documents such expectation to dispose of the reference on merit comes to an end. It is not expected that for years together the Court will pursue the matter suo moto with the expectations for appearance of the workman inspite of issuance of registered notices. As per I.D. Act the workman expecting under provisions of Section 2A is debarred from raising any industrial dispute. The disputes are mainly raised by the Union for their workmen. These unions inspite of receiving notices do not care to appear before the Court for the interest of the workman and as a result they have been deprived of getting any justice. Until and unless the attitude of the union is changed I consider that this uncalled for situation will persist. Definitely it is the duty of the Court to dispose of the reference on merit but it depends on the cooperation of both sides. Here the record will clearly expose that sufficient opportunities had been given to the workman/union but yielded no result. This attitude shows clearly that the workman side is not interested to proceed with the hearing of the case for disposal on merit.

Under the facts and circumstances, I also do not find any sufficient reason to drag on the case for an indefinite

period. Accordingly as there is no scope to dispose of the reference in question on merit, the same is closed.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1665.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/प्रम न्यायालय नं.-2, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 2/76 ऑफ 2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/162/2002-आई. आर. (बी. II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st May, 2003

S.O. 1665.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. 2/76 of 2002 of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Mumbai No. 2 as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the management of Union Bank of India and their workman, received by the Central Government on 21-05-2003.

[No. L-12011/162/2002-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. II MUMBAI

PRESENT:

S. N. SAUNDANKAR,

Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/76 OF 2002

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE
MANAGEMENT OF

UNION BANK OF INDIA

The General Manager (P),

Union Bank of India

239, Vidhan Bhawan Marg,
Nariman Point

MUMBAI-400 021.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

The General Secretary,
Union Bank Karmachari Sena,
Union Bank Bldg.
Mumbai Samachar Marg,
Mumbai 400 023.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYERS: No Appearance.

FOR THE WORKMEN : No Appearance.

Mumbai Dated, the 2nd May, 2003

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, by its Order No. L-12011/162/2002-IR(B-II), dtd. 11-10-2002 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

“Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India to impose the Punishment of withdrawal of Special Allowance to Shri S.D. Parab, Head Cashier ‘C’ vide order dated 30-10-1999 is legal and justified ? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?”

2. Record shows that the union through served did not appear not filed Statement of Claim though sufficient time given which indicates that the union is not interested in prosecuting the reference. Therefore reference stands disposed of for non-prosecution and hence the following order is passed :—

ORDER

Reference stands disposed of for non-prosecution.

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1666.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लिमिटेड के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण अजमेर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीआईटीआरनं. 07/02) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-5-03 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/51/2002-आई. आर. (बी.-I)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21th May, 2003

S.O. 1666.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (CI TR No. 07/02) of the Industrial Tribunal, Ajmer now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Rajasthan Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-5-2003.

[No. L-12012/51/2002-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

**न्यायालय श्रम एवं औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण, अजमेर
(राज०)**

पीठासीन अधिकारी : अतुल कुमार जैन, आरएचजेएस

सीआईटीआर 07/02

[रेफरेंस नं. एल.-12012/51/2002-आर. (बी-1)दिनांकित
30.4.02]

जमुना शंकर पुत्र रूपालाल लोधा द्वारा श्री ललित शर्मा, अध्यक्ष
राजस्थान (स्टेट) बैंक वर्कर्स आर्गनाइजेशन, जयपुर

—प्रार्थी/प्राप्ति

बनाम

1. मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर, सेंट्रल ऑफिस सी-3 सरदार पटेल मार्ग,
सी स्कीम, जयपुर
2. चीफ मैनेजर बैंक ऑफ राज. लि. इंडस्ट्रियल फाइनेंस ब्रांच,
गंगापुर गांधीनगर, पुर रोड, भीलवाड़ा, जरिये प्रतिनिधि
श्री जी. पी. मालू, सहायक प्रबंधक, बैंक ऑफ राज. लि.
कार्मिक मानव संसाधन विभाग केंद्रीय कार्यालय सी-3 सरदार
पटेल मार्ग, सी स्कीम, जयपुर।

दिनांक 28-4-2003

अवार्ड

केन्द्र सरकार ने रेफरेंस धारा 10 औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम,
1947 के तहत निम्न प्रकार भेजा था : “क्या प्रार्थी कर्मकार श्री जमुना
शंकर लोधा पुत्र श्री रूपालाल लोधा को उसके नियोजक (विषयी सं.
1 व 2) द्वारा दि. 8-8-01 को सेवा से पृथक् किया जाना उचित एवं वैध है ? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार अपने नियोजक से क्या राहत पाने का
अधिकारी है ?”

उक्त रेफरेंस के चलते उभयपक्ष में लोक अदालत की भावना से
राजीनामा हो गया तथा दि. 7-4-03 को गवाहान् ललित शर्मा तथा
अनिल माथुर के दस्तखतों के साथ उभयपक्षों ने दो पृष्ठों में राजीनामा
पेश किया। राजीनामे पर श्रमिक जमुना शंकर के तथा विपक्षीगण के
अधिकृत प्रतिनिधि श्री जी. पी. मालू के हस्ताक्षर भी कराये गये हैं।
असल राजीनामा पत्रावली में शामिल रखा गया है। उस राजीनामे की
एक फोटो कॉपी इस अवार्ड में परिशिष्ट-1 समझी जायेगी। अवार्ड का
निपटारा परिशिष्ट-1 में वर्णित प्रकार से किया जाना माना जाये। तरनुसार
अवार्ड एतद्वारा पारित किया जाता है।

अतुल कुमार जैन, न्यायाधीश

समक्ष माननीय प्राधिकारी, श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक

न्यायाधिकरण, अजमेर

प्रकरण संख्या : सी०आई०टी०आर० 7/2002

जमना शंकर पुत्र श्री रूपा लाल लोधा

द्वारा — श्री ललित शर्मा, अध्यक्ष, राजस्थान (स्टेट) बैंक वर्कर्स
आर्गनाइजेशन द्वारा एस.बी.बी.जे., सुराणा मार्केट, शाखा पाली, मारवाड़।

बनाम

दी बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लि०, जयपुर

प्रार्थी एवं अप्रार्थी के मध्य समझौता

मान्यवर महोदय,

दोनों पक्षों में उपरोक्त बाद में निम्न शर्तों पर समझौता सम्पन्न हुआ है :

- (1) यह कि अप्रार्थी प्रारम्भ में प्रार्थी को छः माह के परिवीक्षा काल पर चपरासी सह फर्राश के पद पर महाराष्ट्र या गुजरात राज्य या चण्डीगढ़ की किसी भी शाखा अथवा कार्यालय में रिक्ति के अनुसार नियुक्ति देगा।
- (2) यह कि प्रार्थी को पूर्व में दैनिक वेतनभोगी या अस्थायी रूप से सेवाओं का कोई लाभ वेतनवृद्धि, अवकाश इत्यादि देय नहीं होगा। अप्रार्थी प्रार्थी को इस समझौते के पूर्व एवं बाद में सेवा ज्ञायनिंग करने तक की अवधि के लिये कोई वेतन व अन्य लाभ का भुगतान नहीं करेगा। एवं प्रार्थी को पुराने सेवा के स्थान पर अप्रार्थी बैंक में चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के नये कर्मकार के रूप में माना जावेगा।
- (3) यह कि पिछले सेवा काल का लाभ, वरिष्ठता, पदोन्नति या वेतन वृद्धि इत्यादि प्रार्थी को देय नहीं होगा तथा प्रार्थी कभी भी उक्त लाभों की मांग नहीं करेगा।
- (4) यह कि प्रार्थी को चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के लिये बाई-पाराइट सैटलमेंट जो कि वर्तमान में लागू है, के अनुसार मूल वेतन, सीसीए, मकान किराया, मंहगाई भत्ता आदि जो देय बनता है, वह सभी जोड़कर नियमानुसार वेतन का भुगतान किया जावेगा।
- (5) यह कि प्रार्थी जमना शंकर लोधा की शैक्षणिक योग्यता स्नातक है जो कि चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी की निर्धारित योग्यता (आठवीं पास) से अधिक है। अतः प्रार्थी इस समझौते के अन्तर्गत चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के पद पर कार्यभार संभालने से चार वर्ष की अवधि तक उच्च पद के लिए स्थायी एवं अस्थायी आफिसियेटिंग अनाउन्स की मांग नहीं करेगा। इसके साथ ही प्रार्थी भविष्य में अप्रार्थी बैंक द्वारा निर्धारित लिपिक पद के लिए प्रतियोगी परीक्षा पास करने के उपरान्त ही लिपिक पद पर पदोन्नति का अधिकारी होगा। अर्थात् प्रार्थी स्नातक की शैक्षणिक योग्यता के आधार पर बिना प्रतियोगी परीक्षा पास किया सीधे लिपिक पद पर पदोन्नति का अधिकारी नहीं होगा।
- (6) यह कि समझौते के आधार पर माननीय प्राधिकारी, श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अजमेर द्वारा अधिनिर्णय पारित करने की तिथि से 60 दिनों के अन्दर अप्रार्थी बैंक प्रार्थी जमना शंकर लोधा को नियुक्ति पत्र जारी करेगा। उक्त नियुक्ति पत्र प्राप्त होने के 15 दिन के अन्दर-अन्दर प्रार्थी अप्रार्थी बैंक

- के बतलाये गए स्थान/शाखा कार्यालय पर छूटी पर अपनी उपस्थिति देगा। अगर प्रार्थी बिना किसी उचित कारण के 15 दिनों की अवधि में इयूटी पर उपस्थित नहीं होता है तो प्रार्थी का उक्त पोस्ट पर अधिकार समाप्त हो जावेगा तथा प्रार्थी उक्त पोस्ट पाने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा।
- (7) यह कि समझौते के अनुसार आज के पूर्व में की गई सेवा की एवज में अन्य कोई भी पोस्ट, कोई भी लाभ, कोई भी रकम प्रार्थी जमना शंकर लोधा अप्रार्थी बैंक से प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा।
- (8) उपरोक्त समस्त क्लेम, निपटारा इस समझौते के तहत समझा जावेगा एवं प्रार्थी जमना शंकर लोधा किसी भी न्यायालय, ट्रिब्यूनल या समझौता अधिकारी के समक्ष उक्त नौकरी व क्लेम से सम्बन्धित विवाद उठाने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा।

उपरोक्त समझौता प्रार्थी एवं अप्रार्थी के मध्य बिना किसी ओर दबाव एवं दोनों पक्षों की आपसी सहमति से सम्पन्न हुआ है। अतः दोनों पक्षकारों की ओर से माननीय न्यायालय से निवेदन है कि उपरोक्त समझौते के आधार पर अवार्ड पारित कर दिया जावे।

अजमेर

दिनांक 7-4-2003

प्रार्थी पक्ष

(जमना शंकर लोधा)

अप्रार्थी पक्ष

(जी.पी. मालू)

सहायक प्रबन्धक

दी बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लिंग

कार्मिक एवं मानव संसाधन विभाग

केन्द्रीय कार्यालय, सी-३,

सरदार पटेल मार्ग,

सी-स्कीम, जयपुर

2. गवाह

(अनिल माधुर)

अंचल सचिव

नैशनल आर्गें. ऑफ

बैंक वर्कर्स द्वारा पंजाब

नैशनल बैंक

ब्रह्मपुरी, जयपुर

1. गवाह

(ललित शर्मा)

राजस्थान (स्टेट) बैंक वर्कर्स

आरगेनाईजेशन द्वारा एस.बी.बी.जे.

मण्डिया शाखा,

पाली-मारवाड़ (राज.)

मई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1667.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दि बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अजमेर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी.आई.टी.आर. नं० 06/02) को

प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/58/2002-आई.आर.(बी. I)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st May, 2003

S.O. 1667.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (CITR No. No. 6/02) of the Industrial Tribunal Ajmer now as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of The Bank of Rajasthan Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-5-2003.

[No. L-12012/58/2002-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

न्यायालय : श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण,
अजमेर

सीआईटीआर नं. 6/02

रेफरेंस नम्बर एल-12012/58/2002/आई.आर.(बी.-१)
दि. 30-5-02

श्री मदनलाल शर्मा पुत्र श्री मिश्रीलाल मार्फत क्षेत्रीय सचिव, बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान, एम्प्लाईज चूनियन, भीलवाडा (राज.)

—प्रार्थी- श्रमिक

बनाम

प्रबन्ध निदेशक, राजस्थान बैंक लि., केन्द्रीय शाखा कार्यालय,
जयपुर

—अप्रार्थी-नियोजक

समक्ष श्री अतुल कुमार जैन, आर एच जे एस
प्रार्थी की ओर से : श्री मदनलाल स्वयं व एन.के. गुप्ता एडवोकेट
अप्रार्थी की ओर से : श्री जी.पी. मालू व कृष्णअवतार एडवोकेट
—: अवार्ड :— दिनांक 24-4-2003

आज प्रार्थी श्रमिक एवं नियोजकों की ओर से एक आवेदन पत्र पेश कर जाहिर किया गया है कि उनके बीच एक समझौता हो गया है उपरोक्त समझौता जो दो पृष्ठों में है भी पेश किया गया है।

मैंने उभय पक्षकारान को सुना।

उभय पक्ष के बीच हुए आपसी समझौते को देखते हुए इस प्रकरण में “कोई विवाद नहीं अवार्ड” पारित किया जाता है। आज प्रस्तुत समझौते को इस अवार्ड का आवश्यक भाग माना जावे।

अवार्ड आज दिनांक 24-4-03 को खुले न्यायालय में लिखाय जाकर सुनाया गया।

अतुल कुमार जैन, न्यायाधीश

**समक्ष माननीय प्राधिकारी, श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक
न्यायाधिकरण, अजमेर**

प्रकरण संख्या: सी.आई.टी.आर. 6/2002

मदन लाल शर्मा पुत्र श्री मिश्री लाल शर्मा

बनाम

दी बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लि. जयपुर

प्रार्थी एवं अप्रार्थी के मध्य समझौता

मान्यवर महोदय,

दोनों पक्षों में उपरोक्त बाद में निम्न शर्तों पर समझौता सम्पन्न हुआ है :

- (1) यह कि अप्रार्थी प्रारम्भ में प्रार्थी को छः माह की परिवीक्षा काल पर चपरासी-सह-फर्फश के पद पर राजस्थान राज्य या इसके बाहर अप्रार्थी बैंक की किसी भी शाखा अथवा कार्यालय में आवश्यकतानुसार नियुक्ति देगा।
- (2) यह कि प्रार्थी को पूर्व में दैनिक वेतन भोगी या अस्थायी रूप से सेवाओं का कोई लाभ वेतन वृद्धि अवकाश इत्यादि देय नहीं होगा। अप्रार्थी प्रार्थी को इस समझौते के पूर्व एवं बाद में सेवा जोईनिंग करने तक की अवधि के लिये कोई वेतन व अन्य लाभ का भुगतान नहीं करेगा। एवं प्रार्थी को पुराने सेवा के स्थान पर अप्रार्थी बैंक में चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के नये कर्मकार के रूप में माना जावेगा।
- (3) यह कि पिछले सेवा काल का लाभ, वरिष्ठता पदोन्नति या वेतन वृद्धि इत्यादि प्रार्थी को देय नहीं होगा तथा प्रार्थी कभी भी उक्त लाभों की मांग नहीं करेगा।
- (4) यह कि प्रार्थी को चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के लिये आः पारटाइट सैटलमेन्ट जो कि वर्तमान में लागू है, देने अनुसार मूल वेतन, सीसीए, मकान किराया, मंहगाई भत्ता आदि जो देय बनता है, वह सभी जोड़कर नियमानुसार वेतन का भुगतान किया जायेगा।
- (5) यह कि प्रार्थी मदन लाल शर्मा की शैक्षणिक योग्यता मैट्रिक है जो कि चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी की निर्धारित योग्यता (आठवीं पास) से अधिक है। अतः प्रार्थी इस समझौते के अन्तर्गत चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी के पद पर कार्यभार संभालने से चार वर्ष की अवधि तक उच्च पद के लिए स्थायी एवं अस्थायी आफिसियेटिंग अलाउन्स की मांग नहीं करेगा।
- (6) यह कि समझौते के आधार पर माननीय प्राधिकारी, श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक अधिकरण अजमेर द्वारा अधिनिर्णय पारित करने की तिथि से 60 दिनों के अन्दर-अन्दर अप्रार्थी बैंक प्रार्थी मदन लाल शर्मा

को नियुक्ति पत्र जारी करेगा। उक्त नियुक्ति पत्र प्राप्त होने के 15 दिन के अन्दर-अन्दर प्रार्थी अप्रार्थी बैंक के बतलाये गए स्थान/शाखा कार्यालय पर ड्यूटी पर अपनी उपस्थित देगा। अगर प्रार्थी बिना किसी उचित कारण के 15 दिनों की अवधि में ड्यूटी पर उपस्थित नहीं होता है तो प्रार्थी का उक्त पोस्ट पर अधिकार समाप्त हो जावेगा तथा प्रार्थी उक्त पोस्ट पाने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा।

- (7) यह कि समझौते के अनुसार आज के पूर्व में की गई सेवा की एवज में अन्य कोई भी पोस्ट, कोई भी लाभ, कोई भी रकम प्रार्थी मदन लाल शर्मा अप्रार्थी बैंक से प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं होगा।
- (8) उपरोक्त समस्त व्यवस्था निपटारा इस समझौते के तहत समझा जावेगा एवं प्रार्थी मदन लाल शर्मा किसी भी न्यायालय, द्रिब्युनल या समझौता अधिकारी के समक्ष उक्त नौकरी व क्लेम से सम्बन्धित विवाद उठाने को अधिकारी नहीं होगा।

उपरोक्त समझौता प्रार्थी एवं अप्रार्थी के मध्य बिना किसी जोर दबाव एवं दोनों पक्षों की आपसी सहमति से सम्पन्न हुआ है। अतः दोनों पक्षकारों की ओर से माननीय न्यायालय से निवेदन है कि उपरोक्त समझौते के आधार पर अवार्ड पारित कर दिया जावे।

अजमेर

दिनांक 24-04-2003

प्रार्थी पक्ष

(मदन लाल शर्मा)

अप्रार्थी पक्ष

(जी.पी. मालू)

सहायक प्रबन्धक

दी बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लि.

कार्मिक एवं मानव संसाधन विभाग

केन्द्रीय कार्यालय, सी-3 सरदार पटेल मार्ग,

सी-स्कीम, जयपुर।

गवाह:

—मिश्री लाल शर्मा

4च 50 पुराना आषू नगर,

भीलवाड़ा (राज.)

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का. आ. 1668.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एच.पी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध निवाजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण मुंबई नं. 1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 34/1993) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-5-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/3/93-आई.आर. (विविध)]

बी.एम. डेविड, अवर साचिव

New Delhi, the 21st May, 2003

S.O. 1668.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref No. 34/1993) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Mumbai No. 1 as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-30012/3/93-IR(M)]

B.M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 1) MUMBAI

PRESENT

SHRI JUSTICE S. C. PANDEY,
Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-34/1993

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the Management of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd.
and their workman.

APPEARANCE:

For the Management : Mr. Mhaske, Adv.
For the Workman : Mr. Nabar, Adv.
State : Maharashtra

Mumbai dated the 30th day of April, 2003

AWARD-PART II

1. This is a reference made by the Central Government in exercise of its power under clause (d) of sub section 1 of section 10 of Industrial Disputes act 1947 (the Act for short) read with sub-section 2A thereof for adjudicating upon the dispute between Mr. A. W. Gawde (the workman of short) and the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd. (The Corporation for short) The terms of the reference given in the schedule to the order of reference are as follows :

“Whether the action of the management of H.P.C.L. in terminating the services of Mr. A. W. Gawade, Sr. Process Technician with effect from 18th November, 1991 is legal and justified ? If not, what relief the workman are entitled ?”

2. By part award dated 9-10-1996 it was found by this tribunal that the enquiry conducted by the Corporation was legal and proper. Thereafter, the case was adjourned for hearing the argument on the question of perversity of findings Justice Shri R. S. Verma by part award dated 19-3-1997 held that findings recorded against the workman were perverse. He give an opportunity to the Corporation to prove the charges; independent of the enquiry, before this Tribunal. The evidence led by the Corporation could

not be completed during the tenure of Justice Shri R.S. Verma and his successor Justice C.V. Govardhan. Now since, the parties have led evidence, and the case was argued either parties on merits of evidence led before this tribunal, this tribunal proceeds to record its findings on the question of misconduct committed by the workman.

3. It is made clear that this tribunal is bound by part awards dated 9-10-1996 and 19-3-1997. The only question this tribunal is now required to decide if the Corporation had proved charges against the workman. Therefore, this tribunal shall not refer to those facts which culminated in the order of dismissal of the workman from 18-11-1991, pursuant to the enquiry held by the Corporation.

4. In order to understand the alleged misconduct against the workman, it would be proper to bear in mind, the allegations culled out from the charge sheet. The workman was holding the post of Senior Process Technician in Mumbai Refinery of the Corporation. It is alleged as per charge sheet dated 14-11-1988, that workman released the Tanker Truck No. MCU-34 around 13 hours on 26-10-1985 during the course of his duty. It was over loaded by 4880 kgs of Carbon Black Feed Stock (C.B.F.S.) as against the quantity mentioned in the invoice of the company purchasing the aforesaid commodity. The charge sheet further stated that in the confessional statement made by the Police on 21-6-1986, Shri V.D. Mohite had stated that in Oct/November the Truck No. MCU 34 was over loaded and he had received Rs. 1600/- as his share from the workman. The workman was charged with the breach of following clauses of Standing Orders applicable to him.

28(IX) Fraud or dishonesty in connection with the company.

28(XXII) Commission of any act subversive of good behaviour or discipline of the establishment.

5. The Corporation filed the affidavit of the following persons. (i) Digesh Kumar Agarwal (ii) Dilip Gopal Ghatkar (iii) Ajit Prabhakar Gokhle for proving charges. It also relied on certain documents which were filed by it before the Enquiry Officer. All these witnesses were cross examined on behalf of the workman. It may be mentioned here that one Ashok Laxman Khilair was summoned by the Corporation but he was given up earlier. Subsequently, a statement on oath made by Ashok Laxman Khilari in Reference No. 2 CGIT-2 of 1995 was placed on record on 30-1-2002.

6. The workman filed his affidavit in his defence. He was cross-examined thereafter, he closed his case.

7. This tribunal now examines the evidence led by the Corporation MW1 Digesh Kumar Agarwal in his affidavit revealed the procedure of filling up of C.B.F.S. in Tank Trucks in Mumbai refinery of the Corporation. One tanker truck at a time was brought at weighment along with authorization slip. The weighment bridge was operated for recording of Tare weight of the tanker truck. The weight so

recorded was noted on the authorization slip as well as weigh bridge register. Thereafter, the tanker truck was taken for loading. After loading was done, the Tanker truck was again brought on the weighment bridge. This time gross weight of loaded truck was again noted on the authorization slip and the weighment register. Each time the noting was done by the operator of the weighment bridge and the Supervisor was required to counter sign the authorization slip and the weighment register. Thereafter, the truck was taken to pass window for obtaining gate pass from Clerk/Technician. This gate pass was required to be signed by the Supervisor after due verification of contents. Mr. Agarwal admitted that he had no personal knowledge of the incident for which the workman was charged. Similary, MW2 Dilip Gopal Ghatkar also outlined the same procedure as given by Shri Digesh Kumar Agrawal. He stated that aforesaid procedure was actually followed at the time the incident took place on 26-10-1985. He too did not have any personal knowledge about the incident. Therefore, the proof of charge framed against the workman depends upon the testimony of one witness A. P. Gokhle MW3 so far as the Corporation is concerned. The main charge against the workman was that he knew that the Tanker truck No. MCU 34 was carrying 4880 kgs. CBFs more than the quantity mentioned in the Invoice dated 26-10-1985 and that in order to help the party carrying the excess CBFS, he released the truck on his own, without waiting for Mr. Ribellow who had gone for launch after instructing the workman to wait for him. It is alleged that invoice showed tanker truck was filled with 9880 kgs. of CBFS whereas it was filled to full capacity 14,680 kgs. It is also stated that workman paid Rs. 1,600/- as his share to Mr. Mohite who had also witnessed the fact of overloading on 26-10-85 during the course of his duty. Mr. Mohite had confesed this fact in his police statement, who had filled excess of CBFS, on the tanker of MCU34 on 26-10-1985 and this fact Mr. Mohite in his Police Statement Mr. Gokhle's evidence has to be seen in the aforesaid back ground. Mr. Gokhale admitted in his cross-examination that he was not present at the spot where the incident took place. It is apparent he was not an eye witness of the event that took place. When the tanker truck was loaded and was allowed to pass allegedly carrying 4880 kgs. CBFS more than that was mentioned in the invoice. In paragraph 7 of his affidavit, Mr. Gokhale had stated that he had prepared a note dated 20-4-1985 in respect of the capacity of MCU 34. This document (marked as M4) is at page 114 of the enquiry dated 26-10-1980. According to this document, the truck tanker had a tare weight of 6,640 kgs. The gross weight of the full loaded truck tanker would be 21,320 kgs. If we deduct the Tare weight from the gross weight of the Truck then the maximum capacity of the truck for fully loaded CBFS would be 14,680 kgs. It was said by the Mr. Gokhle that aforesaid note was prepared by him on 26-10-1985, but the date was wrongly mentioned as 26-10-1980. It appears from the aforesaid document M-4 that the information supplied in it was on the basis of a loading on

21-4-1985. However, the following extract from the cross-examination of this witness makes his statement unreliable.

"The document M-4 marked as Ex. P-2 in the enquiry dated 26th October, 1985 is not based on my personal knowledge. I am unable to say at what time and date I have made the document, on 26-10-1985 I had written this document that on 20th April, 1985 the truck No. MCU-34 was filled with to the extent of 14,600 kgs."

Futher, the witness stated in his affidavit in paragraph 9 of his affidavit that a Truck Contractor would always fill his truck to full capacity and therefore, the tanker should have been filled to extent of 14,680 kgs. In cross-examination this witness admitted that truck MCU-34 carried 9,140 kgs., 9,880 kgs., 9,960 kgs. and 9,600 kgs. of CBFS in the month of Januray to March 1986. He agreed that it was not isolated event that same truck was filled upto 9,880 kgs. of CBFS on 26-10-1985. He stated that capacity depended upon the truck carried by the lorry. He could not say if the tanks were changed in the month of January, February or March. However, in his cross-examination at page 2 the witness stated that :

"The quantity in the weighment slip and the gate pass tally with each other. I have no perosnal knowledge regarding the capacity of the tank in MCU-34. I would not be able to say whether the capacity of the tank in the tank lorry MCU-34 on 26-10-1985 would be 9,880 kgs."

In view of the evidence of Shri A. P. Gokhle, it is difficult to say that the tanker of MCU-34 was filled to the full capacity. The statement of workman that he had released the tanker truck in presence of Mr. Chandwani, a Deputy Manager has not been disproved. This tribunal is asked to rely upon the statement of V. D. Mohite. The statement made by Mohite on 12th March, 1986 has not been proved by producing Mohite or the Officer or the witnesses before whom the confession war recorded. MW-3 A.P. Gokhle made statement that the document Ex. P3 produced in the enquiry was statement of V. D. Mohite implicating himself and the workman. Shri Gakhle admitted in cross-examination that he was not a witness to recording of Ex. P3. He had no personal knowledge about the version given by Mohite to Police. It is clear that Shri Gokhle was giving evidence after the enquiry was set aside. All that he could say that Ex. P3 was produced in the inquiry. That is all he knew. This would not be sufficient. The proof of Ex. P3 could not be given by examining Shri Gokhle. The statement of Shri Mohite amounts to a confession of co-accused made to police. It is not enough that such confession was made. It should be voluntary. It should be made without inducement threat or promise. The confession of Mohite is a long document. This document so far as the workman concerned makes a statement against the "Thereafter some time in the month of October/November I was on duty with witnessing Shri A.W. Gawde and Shri Chandwani was the

Deputy Manager of General shift on that day Motor Tanker MCU-34 was loaded with near about double quantity than mentioned on the challan. Shri Gawde gave me Rs. 1600/- as may share for giving excess carbonoid".

This is a document signed by Sub-Inspector Police, Crime Branch (Central) CID Bombay dated 26-6-1986. This document is not signed by Mohite. This tribunal does not find that this document on which the Corporation relied has been proved by producing the Sub-Inspector Police Crime Branch Control CID. Actually, nobody had been examined to prove this document which may have been proved during the enquiry. This tribunal cannot extrapolate the happenings in the domestic enquiry at this stage. The enquiry had been held to be vitiated. It appears from the order sheet that Shri A.L. Khilari was summoned as a witness by this tribunal on 06-8-1999. The witness remained absent on 09-9-1999, 8-10-1999, 22-10-1999 and 5-11-1999. The Corporation had undertaken to produce him on 08-10-1999. On 5-11-1999 the Corporation gave up that witness. No reason was recorded in the order sheet for giving up that witness. It appears to be a considered decision of the Corporation that his evidence was of no use. Under these circumstances, it cannot be held that the statement by A.L. Khilari witness was proved in any manner. No attempt was made to summon Vinod Mohite to prove any judicial confession made by him. Certified copy of judicial confession could be placed on record and proved by summoning the witness. This lacuna in the evidence was sought to be filled by filing a copy of alleged statement of A.L. Khilari in CGIT-2/12 of 1995 along with application dated 30-1-2002. The application was for taking the document on record. The document was taken on record but document was not proved in any manner. No affidavit was filed to show when Shri A. L. Khilari died. We do not know why he was given up. The order sheet does not record the reason. Apart from the statement in the application, no attempt was made to prove that Shri A. Khilari died by leading evidence about this fact. No attempt was made to file certificate of his death. Even the judicial confession mentioned in the statement of A. L. Khilari were not produced. This tribunal cannot consider the evidence produced before another tribunal when the workman had no opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses. This tribunal is of the view that merely because a document attached with application is taken on record, it cannot be held to be proved. The party filing a document must obtain the permission from the tribunal to get it exhibited after proving, it unless the opposite party permits its exhibition by admitting the contents of documents. Moreover, the confession or the statement made by Mohite cannot be accepted as such, even if they were self implicating without giving the workman an opportunity to cross-examine the maker of statement. Here it may be made clear that confession made by Mohite before the Metropolitan Magistrate has not been placed on record. The Corporation

ought to have filed the material against the workman which could be considered legally by this tribunal. The statement of A. L. Khilari could not be admitted back door. This tribunal rejects the argument that the statement of A. L. Khilari before CGIT-2 could be considered as proved merely by filing an application for taking that document on record. It further holds that Corporation did not care to file an affidavit or lead evidence to show that A. L. Khilari, had died on or before 05-11-1999 or that he was incapable of giving evidence on that date. There is no affidavit of his death. Even the subsequent death or illness of A. L. Khilari would not give right to Corporation to place his previous statement or record because the Corporation gave him up on 05-11-1999, consciously on the ground that his evidence was not required. It could not take advantage of subsequent death of A. L. Khilari. Further, the statement is not a certified copy. The workman did not have any opportunity to cross-examine the witness who made it. The statement of A. L. Khilari is merely hearsay evidence. The statement recorded by A. L. Khilari could be proved by examining Mohite. No reason was given for not doing so. To be fair, the confession of a person in league with delinquent may be relied upon only when the delinquent is given full opportunity to show that confession was not voluntary and was made under threat, inducement or promise. Therefore, this tribunal holds that no advantage can be derived by the Corporation by placing the Statement of A. L. Khilari before CGIT No. 2 (ibid) on record.

8. Despite the lack proper proof in the evidence led by the Corporation, the workman entered the witness box. He admitted that tanker truck in question was filled with C.B.F.S. on 26-10-1985 in his presence. He denied that it was over loaded. He admitted that Ribello had gone to lunch and had instructed him to await his arrival before allowing the loaded truck to pass. However, he allowed the truck to pass on account of delay in presence of Mr. Chandwani. This was defence the workman had taken at the earliest occasion in his reply to charge sheet. This reply is on record. Since the evidence of Gokhle does not prove that the tanker truck was overloaded, the reply of the workman before this tribunal is plausible. The preponderance of probabilities is that the truck was released in presence of Mr. Chandwani. Nothing prevented the Corporation from examining Chandwani to show that the workman was making a false statement. The application dated 20-2-2002 states that Chandwani was one of the witness present at the time of occurrence at the spot. He could be summoned even if he had retired. The workman has denied in cross-examination that he had paid Rs. 1600 to Mohite. There is no reason to his testimony on oath and prefer the so called confession made by Mohite before the Police Officer, although even Mohite mentions the presence of Chandwani at the time the truck was released. Nothing prevented the Corporation from filing the Certified copy of the confession made by Mohite before Metropolitan Magistrate.

9. In view of above discussion, this tribunal is of the view that charges of misconduct framed against the workman have not been proved. Consequently, the order of dismissal dated 18-4-1991 is set aside. This tribunal can decide a case on the basis of evidence placed before it, and therefore, cannot consider how the matter was dealt with in other cases by the High Court of Bombay. The decisions on questions of facts are not precedents because a tribunal or a court decides the case on the evidence led before it. The learned counsel for Corporation has placed on record a judgement of Hon'ble Justice A. P. Singh of Bombay High Court in W.P. No. 2604 of 1974 decided on 04-9-1996 Yeshwant Bodhkar vs. Hindustan Petroleum. In this decision, his lordship considered primarily three rulings of Supreme Court reported in Jagannath Prasad, Sharma vs. State of UP (AIR 1965 SC 1245) Central Bank of India vs. P. C. Jain (AIR 1969 SC 983) State of Haryana vs. Rattan Singh (AIR 1977 SC 1512) and an unreported decision of the Bombay High Court also. The conclusion was that enquiry officer could not have relied upon confessional statement of a co-accused in a domestic enquiry for holding a person guilty of a misconduct because the evidence of the person who recorded it was, only valid to extent of recording confession but that evidence by itself did not prove the allegations made against the co-accused. This tribunal is fortified in its conclusions by the decision of his lordship on the point and was guided by it.

10. The next question for determination is if the workman is entitled to relief of reinstatement with back wages. It cannot be disputed that this tribunal has wide discretion in such matter specially after enactment of 11-A of the Act. But this tribunal is also enjoined to exercise its discretion, in granting relief the workman on sound judicial principles. The workman had claimed in his affidavit that he remained unemployed through out and was not able to get any job. The workman was not cross-examined on this aspect. Another factor that must be considered is there is considerable delay since 02-8-1993 when reference was received by this tribunal. The order sheet was pursued. It is true that some delay was inherent in the judicial process but the workman himself cannot be held responsible for it. On the other hand the order sheet does indicate that counsel for the Corporation tried to prolong the case by examining Digesh Agarwal and Dilip Ghatkar on the same point. In fact, the case was closed when Shri Khilari could not be produced on 05-11-1999. Then on 20-2-2002 an application was filed for re-opening the case and examining Shri A. P. Gokhle. Thus, Corporation is considered responsible for causing delay to considerable extent. The workman has also stated in his affidavit that he has been acquitted by the trial court and the appeal against acquittal stood dismissed. No cross-examination was made to rebut the aforesaid statement. Thus, there is no stigma attached to the workman. The question, therefore, arises if the reinstatement of the workman shall be the proper remedy. Despite the aforesaid factor operating in favour of the workman this tribunal has power to devise judicial strategy

to give just compensation to the workman instead of reinstatement for loss of his service. The main reason for not granting re-instatement is that workman was dismissed 10 years back and the circumstances in which he was dismissed entitled the Corporation to submit that it had lost confidence in the workman. There is no reason to hold that the facts are otherwise. It was argued on behalf of the workman has not been found guilty. This tribunal is, however, required to take over all view of the matter including the consequence of re-induction of workman on the day the award is passed. Looking to the entire circumstances of the case, this tribunal is of the view that Corporation should be directed to pay to the workman, compensation as if he continued in service for six years more from the date of his dismissal i.e. 18th November, 1991. It is made clear that aforesaid direction is only fictional and not real. This fictional state of affairs is mentioned in order to facilitate the calculation of the compensation in shape of back wages. In calculating the back wages the Corporation shall give all the benefits accrued to the workman which were available to the workman of same rank and category including increase in pay and allowances after 18th November 1991 till 6 years thereafter. The workman shall also be entitled to full salary from the date of his suspension and, therefore, workman shall be paid his remaining salary after deducting the subsistence allowance. Since the order of dismissal dated 18-11-1991 was set aside, the workman shall also be entitled to all the benefits accrued to him during the period of his service till 18-11-1991. He shall be given all the benefits of service already done by him till 18-11-1991 including the retrial benefits, provident fund and gratuity etc. if any. It is made clear that Corporation shall be entitled adjust any amount paid to the workman as a consequence of termination of service prior to passing this award.

11. Thus, the reference is answered by saying that the order of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation dated 18-11-1991 terminating the services of workman A. W. Gawde was illegal and unjustified. It is set aside. However, the Corporation is directed to pay compensation to workman as stated in previous paragraph of this award in lieu of reinstatement. No costs.

S. C. PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का.आ. 1669.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिंग के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मुंबई नं. 2 के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 85/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-05-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल- 30011/52/2002-आईआर (विविध)]

बी० एम० डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st May, 2003

S.O. 1669.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 85/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Mumbai No 2, as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-30011/52/2002-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, AT MUMBAI

PRESENT:

SHRI S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE No. CGIT-2/85 of 2002

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HINDUSTAN PETRÓLEUM CORPORATION LTD.

The General Manager (P)
Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd.
Mahul Refinery, Chembur
Mumbai 400 074.

AND

Their Workmen
The Vice President
Petroleum Employees Union
Tel Rasayan Bhavan
Tilak Road, Dadar
Mumbai 400 014.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. A.G. Pathrose
Representative

FOR THE WORKMEN : No appearance

Mumbai, dated 28th April, 2003

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No.L-30011/52/2002/IR (M) dated 9th December 2002, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“ Whether the action of the management of HPCL, Mahul Refinery in not implementing the MoU arrived at with the Petroleum Employees Union on 2-11-2000

is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?

2. Record shows that on 19-2-2003 Union though served vide acknowledgement Ex-3, none appeared on their behalf, though Representative of management HPCL was present. After giving long date for filing Claim Statement also today none appeared on behalf of Union nor filed Claim Statement which indicates union is not interested in prosecuting the case, hence the order :

ORDER

Reference stands disposed of for non-prosecution.

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 मई, 2003

का.आ. 1670.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स नालको के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार/औद्योगिक अधिकरण भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 235/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-05-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं.एल- 29012/164/98-आई.आर (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st May, 2003

S.O. 1670.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 235/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Nalco and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-5-2003.

[No. L-29012/164/98-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BHUBANESWAR

PRESENT:

Shri S.K. Dhal, OSJS, (Sr. Branch),
Presiding Officer, C.G.I.T.-cum-Labour Court,
Bhubaneswar.

Tr. INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 235/2001

Date of conclusion of hearing 9th April, 2003

Date of Passing Award 29th April, 2003

BETWEEN:

The General Manager (Mines),
M/s. NALCO, Mines Division,
P.O. Damanjodi,
Koraput-763 008. ... 1st Party-Management.

AND

Their Workman Shri Rabindranath Khatua,
C/o. A. P. Sahani, Qrs. No. B/364,
Sector III, At/Po. Damanjodi,
Koraput - 763 008. ... 2nd Party-Workman.

APPEARANCES:

M/s. J. Rath, Advocate. ... For the 1st Party-Management.

M/s. B.S. Tripathy, Advocate ... For the 2nd Party-Workman.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-29012/164/98/IR (M), dated 03-03-1999 :

"Whether the action of the Management of NALCO in terminating the services of Shri R.N. Khatua, skilled worker without any written notice/charges is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?" "Whether the demand of Shri Rabindranath Khatua for full back wages is justified? If so, what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The case of the 2nd Party may be stated in brief.

He was selected in a regular interview conducted by the 1st Party-Management and was initially employed as Mate in Horticulture Department of M.R. Complex, Damanjodi on 5-2-1986 to perform various duties of maintenance of plantations of different species. Though he was employed by the 1st Party-Management yet he was shown to be a contract labourer engaged through contractors. It is further pleaded that when a new contractor is engaged upon expiry of the term of the previous contractor, he is required to execute an agreement with an inbuilt provision to employ the workmen of the previous contractors. By this process, the 2nd Party has been continuing as skilled worker (Mate) in the said Horticulture Department since 5-2-1986. The work performed by him was/is permanent, regular and perennial in nature. Though he was engaged through contractors, yet, he was performing his duties and responsibilities for the benefit of principal employer i.e. the 1 Party-Management. It is pleaded that, to deny the regular job with regular scale of pay, the 1st Party-Management has engaged him through contractors. While the matter was pending the 1st Party-Management prevented him to enter into his premises to perform his jobs. When he tried to know the reason it was disclosed that his service has been terminated. So, since 5-10-1996 he was not been allowed to enter into the premises of the 1st Party-Management. He approached

the Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Titilagarh. The 1st Party-Management was directed to release the differential wages within one month from the date of receiving the order of the Labour Enforcement (Central), but unfortunately the 1st Party-management did not comply the order of the Labour Enforcement Officer (Central). So, he approached the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central) raising a dispute. Both the parties were called for conciliation but the conciliation proceeding failed. Thereafter on the report of the conciliation officer the present reference has been made. In his Claim Statement, the 2nd Party has prayed to declare the termination of his service from 5-10-1996 as bad, illegal and unsustainable in law, to declare that non-regularization of his service in the post of Mate (as a skilled Labour) as bad and illegal in law with further prayer to reinstate him from 5-10-1996 with all consequential service and monetary benefits.

3. The 1st Party-Management has also filed their Written statement in pursuant to the Claim Statement filed by the 2nd Party. It has been pleaded by the 1st Party-Management that the disputant was engaged by different contractors at different spells for carrying out a job contract undertaken by different contractors. The contractors having experience in the particular regard were given the particular work by way of contract. On signing of contract, the said contractors normally engage their people to carry out the job under the contract. It has been further pleaded that, the 1st Party-Management has a set up service conditions for recruitment of its own employees under service conditions. According to him, vacancies are to be notified, necessary interview is to take place for filling up the vacancies. On completion of the interview, offer of appointment has to be issued. In the present case, there no such recruitment has been made for appointment of the disputant. On the other hand; as per his own admission, he was engaged by different contractors and lastly he was engaged by one M/s. Panigrahi Constructions who is a contractor specialized in Civil, Electrical, Horticulture, SPP and production. Further plea of the 1st Party-Management is that during conciliation proceeding since, the contractor was a party to the conciliation proceeding submitted a reply wherein he admitted that he was working in horticulture activities for a period of three months i.e. from June 1995 to August 1995 and after the said period the 2nd Party abandoned his service and disappeared from the work. The contractor took the plea that since the job was on contract basis and payment was made on measurement basis, it was not possible on his part to engage any more Labourers due to small quantity of work. So, according to the 1st Party-Management the disputant was a labourer under the contractor and he voluntarily left the service. The 1st Party-Management has further taken the plea that, the relationship of employer and employee does not exist between the parties and the 2nd Party-disputant is not a workman as per the definition of Industrial Disputes Act.

As regards regularization of service of the 2nd Party, it is pleaded that, he was never on the rolls of the 1st Party-Management and there has been no master and servant relationship, the question of regularization is not maintainable and the disputant is not entitled for any relief.

4. On the above pleading of the parties, the following Issues have been settled.

ISSUES

1. Whether the reference is maintainable?
2. Whether Shri Rabindranath Khatua is a workman under Section 2 (5) of the Industrial Disputes Act?
3. Whether there exists a relationship of master and servant in between the workman and the NALCO Management?
4. Whether the action of the Management of NALCO in terminating the services of Shri Rabindranath Khatua, skilled worker without any written notice/charges is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

Whether the demand of Shri Rabindranath Khatua for full back wages is justified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled?

5. On behalf of the 2nd Party the Workman has examined himself and two documents have been exhibited on his behalf as Ext.-1 and Ext.-2. The 1st Party-Management has also examined two witnesses in support of their case. It may be stated here that, after closure of the evidence when the case was adjourned for argument the 2nd Party himself or his Advocate did not took part during hearing of argument and have remained absent in spite of opportunities given to them. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 1st Party-Management has only been heard during course of argument.

FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. I & II

6. I have taken these two issues first for convenient sake. The main stand of the 1st Party-Management is that in view of the appointment of the disputant that he was a contract labourer he would not come under the definition of workman as per Section 2 (5) of the Industrial Disputes Act and there is no relationship of master and servant between the parties. On the other hand, the 2nd Party has tried to convince the Tribunal by the help of evidence that though he was a labourer under a contractor, he was working for the 1st Party-Management. So, in that case he is a workman and there exists relationship of master and servant between the 1st Party-Management and 2nd Party. After perusal of both documentary and oral evidence of the parties and after hearing on the submissions made, I am

inclined to agree with the submission made on behalf of the 1st Party-Management. The 2nd Party had himself admitted in the cross examination that he had worked under different contractors. He has failed to produce any documents to show that he was selected in any selection process and that he was appointed by the 1st Party-Management. No documents have also been produced on behalf of the 2nd Party to satisfy the Tribunal that he was receiving his wages/salary from the 1st Party-Management and that the 1st Party-Management had administrative control on him. In absence of such materials I am of the opinion, it can not be said that, the disputant is a workman as per the definition of Section 2 (5) of the Industrial Disputes Act and that, there exists relationship of master and servant between the 1st Party-Management and the 2nd Party-disputant. Hence, both these issues are answered in favour of the 1st Party-Management.

ISSUE NO. III

7. Placing reliance in the case of Hira Cement Workers Union -Versus- State of Orissa & Others, reported in 92 (2001) C.L.T. 184, it has been submitted on behalf of the 1st Party-Management that the present reference is not maintainable because this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction to deal with the employment of contract labourer. I have already stated that, the 2nd Party remained absent and did not place any argument. In view of my findings recorded in respect of Issue No. II and III that, the disputant is not a workman and that, there is no relationship of employer and employee the present reference would not be maintainable under those ground also. So, I am not inclined to burden the award for making more discussions in this regard. In other words the reference is not maintainable.

ISSUE NO. IV

When the disputant is not a workman under the 1st Party-Management and there is no relationship of employer and employee between the parties and when the present reference is not maintainable the reasons recorded by me in the previous paragraphs it can not be said that, the action of the 1st Party-Management in terminating the service of the disputant is illegal and that, the disputant is not entitled for reinstatement with back wages. In other words the disputant is not entitled for any relief.

9. Reference is answered accordingly.

S. K. DHAL, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE C.G.I.T.-CUM-LABOUR
COURT : BHUBANESWAR

Tr. I.D. Case No. 235/2001

List of the Witnesses Examined on behalf of the 2nd Party-Union.

W.W. No. 1. Shri Rabindranath Khatua (2nd Party-himself)

List of the Witnesses Examined on behalf of the 1st Party-Management.

M.W. No. 1. Shri Prafulla Chandra Naik.

M.W. No. 2. Shri Purna Chandra Sethy.

List of Documents exhibited on behalf of the 2nd Party-Workman.

Ext-1. Failure report dated 7-8-1998 of the A.L.C.(C), Bhubaneswar.

Ext-2. Order for issue of Labour Gate pass.

List of Documents exhibited on behalf of the 1st Party-Management.

Ext-A Copy of the proceeding dated 28-1-1997.

नई दिल्ली, 23 मई, 2003

का.आ. 1671.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं० II, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-2/18 ऑफ 1999) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-05-03 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल- 12012/151/98-आई.आर.(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd May, 2003

S.O. 1671.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/18 of 1999) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/ No. II, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-5-2003.

[No. L-12012/151/98-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
NO. II MUMBAI

Present

Shri S. N. Saundankar : Presiding Officer

REFERENCE No. CGIT-2/18 of 1999

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT
OF RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

The Governor,
Reserve Bank of India,
Post Box No. 901,
Mumbai 400 001.

AND

Their Workmen

Shri D.A. Karkhanis,
C/o. Shri D. S. Kadam,
B-407, Kamlesh Apartment,
Sher-e-Punjab Co-op Housing Society
Near Tolani College,
Andheri (E),
Mumbai 400 093

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Ms. M. Anand
Representative.

FOR THE WORKMEN : No appearance.

Mumbai, dated 17th February, 2003.

AWARD—PART-II

By the Interim Award dated 22nd August 2002 this Tribunal held that the domestic inquiry conducted against the workman Mr. Karkhanis was as per the Principles of Natural Justice and the findings of the inquiry officer are not perverse. Consequently the point crops on as to whether the action of the management in imposing the punishment of dismissal of workman is justified or not in so far Issue Nos. 3 and 4 are concerned vide (Exhibit-15) as mentioned below :

Issues	Findings
3. Whether the action of the management of Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai in dismissing the workman Karkhanis from service is justified?	Yes.
If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?	As per order below.

REASONS

2. On perusal of the record it is seen the interim Award was published vide (Exhibit-95) on 30-9-2002. Notice was issued to both the parties to lead evidence on the quantum of punishment, however the workman remained absent throughout as seen from the Rojnama which indicative to show that he has nothing to say on the quantum of punishment.

3. Vide Statement of Claim (Exhibit-10) workman who had joined as clerk Grade-II in 1965 and promoted as clerk Grade-I in 1972 averred that punishment imposed upon him is disproportionate to the charges however as stated above, he has not lead any evidence to that effect.

4. since the inquiry was fair and proper this Tribunal has to see in the light of Section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act whether the punishment is disproportionate. It is well settled position that penalty imposed must be

commensurate with the gravity of the offence charged and that discretion conferred by Section 11-A on the Tribunal is to be exercised considering the case as a whole. In Syndicate Bank Ltd V/s. Its Workmen 1996 ILLJ pg. 440. Their Lordships observed :

"Industrial adjudicators should be very careful before it interferes with the orders made by the management in discharge of their Managerial functions."

The charges proved against the workman are that he had forged the signature of Shri Roy, Executive Director for wrongful gain on letters to the Financial Institutions which is grave misconduct within the meaning of Regulation-47. It is seen during the relevant period due to acute balance payment position certain restrictions were imposed on the out flow of foreign exchange and had the letter in question was acted upon it would have caused great loss to the country. The bank employee is required to maintain good conduct and Discipline and to act to the best of his Judgment in performance of his financial duties and in exercise of powers conferred upon him he is supposed to act within the limits of his authority. Indiscipline cannot be condoned on the spacious ground that it was not actuated by ulterior motives or by extraneous considerations. Regulation-3 requires every bank employee to take possible steps to protect the interests of the bank and to discharge his duties with utmost integrity and honesty, breach of which is a 'misconduct' within the meaning of Banking Regulations-24 as laid down in the case of The Disciplinary Authority-cum-Regional Manager and Ors. V/s. Nikunj Bihari Patnaik JT 1996(4) SC pg. 457. If in the banking business absolute devotion, diligence, integrity and honesty is not observed the confidence of the public depositors would be impaired. Therefore considering the proved charge which amounts to grave misconduct, the only penalty of dismissal imposed upon the workman is proportionate. In this view of the matter the action of the management is totally justified. Consequently workman is not entitled to any relief. Issues 3 and 4 are answered accordingly and hence the order :—

ORDER

The action of the management of Reserve Bank of India Mumbai in dismissing the services of workman Shri D.A. Karkhanis from the service of the Bank is justified.

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 मई, 2003

का.आ. 1672.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोकण रेलवे कार्पोरेशन के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. II, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी.-

2/18 ऑफ 2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-05-03 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल- 41012/220/2000-आई.आर.(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd May, 2003

S.O. 1672.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/18 of 2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. II, Mumbai, now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-5-2003.

[No. L-41012/220/2000-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. II,

MUMBAI

Present :

Shri S. N. Saundankar : Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-2/18 of 2001

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF KONKAN RLY. CORPORATION LTD.,
MAHARASHTRA

The Chief Engineer (South)
Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd.,
Ratnagiri (South), Railway Complex,
MIDC, Mirsole, Ratnagiri-415 639
Maharashtra

AND

THEIR WORKMEN

Shri Harishchandra Vithu Bhosale
At Pali, Post Kalamundi,
Tal. Guhagar, Distt. Ratnagiri
Maharashtra 415 702.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE EMPLOYER : Mr. Prakash Kilpady
Advocate

FOR THE WORKMEN : Mr. Jaiprakash Sawant
Advocate.

Mumbai, dated 18th February, 2003.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No.L-41012/220/2000/IR (B-I) dated 30-1-2001, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“ Whether the action of the management of Chief Engineer (South) Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd., Ratnagiri in terminating the services of Shri Harishchandra Vithu Bhosle, Watchman w.e.f. 1-7-1995 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. Workman Bhosale was in the employment of management Konkan Railway Corporation. Vide Statement of claim (Ex-7) workman contended that he worked as watchman in the Corporations Office at Lanjekar Compound, Udyan Nagar, Ratnagiri w.e.f. 14-12-1992 till he was orally terminated on 1-7-95. It is averred that workman was in continuous employment and still he was not granted any concession of Earned Leave etc. He was getting wages @Rs. 900/- per month by cheque. It is pleaded workman's services were orally terminated by the management illegally. Therefore he had approached the Chief Engineer of the Corporation Mr. Gupta, however, without assurances nothing was done. Therefore he raised dispute by the letter dated 29-1-2000 with ALC (C) Vasco da gamma who in turn, tried Conciliation, but failed. It is contended since service of workman was illegally terminated, management Corporation be directed to reinstate him in service with full back wages.

3. Management Corporation resisted the claim of workman by filing written statement (Ex-10) contending that workman was engaged on oral contract on daily wages to be paid monthly (@Rs. 30/- per day for the time the work exists. It is averred that workman did not report to duty from 1st July '95, without assigning any reason, and remained absent, thereafter voluntarily, though his services were required by the Corporation at that time. He was given several oral messages through his brother, however he did not turn up thereby he had abandoned the contract employment and never reported after 1st July '95 and that after lapse of four and a half years for the first time, he raised dispute with ALC(C) which suffers from delay and laches, consequently not maintainable. It is pleaded that since workman was given employment on oral contract on daily wages and since he did not turn up, question of termination of his service does not arise. Management denied that workman was in continuous service w.e.f. 14-12-92 to 1-7-95. It is pleaded since workman abandoned the service voluntarily question of his termination does not arise and therefore his claim being devoid of substance be dismissed with costs.

4. By Rejoinder (Exhibit-11) workman reiterated the recitals in the Statement of Claim denying the averments in the Written Statement contending that he was in continuous service and that in contravention to the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, his services were terminated.

5. On the basis of pleadings issues were framed at Exhibit-12 and in that context workman filed affidavit in lieu of Examination in Chief (Exhibit-18) and closed oral evidence vide purshis (Exhibit-19) in rebuttal technical assistant Mr. Waikul filed affidavit (Exhibit-20) on behalf of the Corporation and management closed oral evidence vide purshis (Exhibit-21).

6. Workman filed written submissions (Exhibit-22) and the management (Exhibit-23). On perusing the record as a whole and the written submissions and hearing both sides, I record my findings on the following issues for the reasons mentioned below :

Issues	Findings
1. Whether the workman was in continuous service as contemplated under the Industrial Disputes Act ?	No
2. Whether the management complied with the provisions under the Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd. (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1992 before taking action ?	Does not survive
2A. Whether management proves that workman voluntarily abandoned the service from 1-7-1995 ?	Yes
3. Whether the action of the management of Chief Engineer (South) Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd., Ratnagiri in terminating the services of Shri Harishchandra Vithu Bhosale, watchman w.e.f 1-7-1995 is legal and justified ?	Workman voluntarily abandoned the service.
4. What relief the workman is entitled to ? As per order below.	

REASONS

7. According to workman Bhosale he was employed by the Corporation as watchman w.e.f. 14-12-92 and that he was in continuous service till he was orally terminated on 1-7-95. The Learned Counsel Mr. Sawant for the workman submitted that workman was in continuous service from 14-12-92 to 1-7-95 as contemplated under section 25B of the Industrial Disputes Act and that without complying the provisions under the Act he was terminated from 1-7-95 and therefore his termination is illegal. The Learned Counsel Mr. Kilpady for the Corporation contended that workman was appointed on contract basis

and was not in continuous service and as the depot where the workman was working closed no work exists. He submits that workman was not disengaged but he voluntarily abandoned the service therefore terminating him by the Corporation does not arise. Workman admitted in his cross-examination that he was appointed on contract basis where work of laying tracks and construction of bridges was going on. He further admits that in the month of April'94 he worked for three days and in June'94 21 days. On perusal the documents filed with list (Exhibit-14) shows workman was on contract basis from 14-12-92, and as admitted by him he worked for some days in April and June'94 thereby it is apparent that he was not in continuous service as required under section 25B of the Industrial Disputes Act. According to the Technical Assistant in the Corporation Mr. Waikul, Depot where workman was working is closed and that no work exists. Workman claims to be regular employee of the Corporation and on that basis he contended that his termination without following the provisions under the Industrial Disputes Act is illegal. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court in Mahatma Phule Agricultural University and Ors. V/s. Nasik Zilla Sheth Kamgar Union & Ors. 2001 SCC (L&S) 1180 pointed out that workers cannot be regularised or made permanent even worked for a long period of time or more than 240 days if the post is non-mandatory. In Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors V/s. State of Bihar & Ors. 1997 SCC pg. 1079 Their Lordships of Apex Court observed "daily wage employees who have no right to the post their disengagement is not arbitrary". In the case in hand workman was on contract basis and that his work came to an end therefore under the circumstances he does not get any right and that provisions of KRCL (D & A) Rules, 1992 do not apply to him.

8. According to the management as stated above workman did not turn up since 1-7-95 thereby he has voluntarily abandoned the work. It is seen from the record according to workman he worked from 14-12-92 till 30-6-95. For the first time by letter dtd. 29-1-2000 he had raised dispute with the ALC(C). According to workman he used to approach the officers of the Corporation intermittently however nothing of the sort on record. Had workman in continuous service and not remained absent and despite that, he would have disengaged, he would have raised the dispute immediately and not at the belated stage which goes to show that, he voluntarily remained absent and since he was on contract basis, question of his termination does not arise in view of the legal position discussed supra. Consequently workman is not entitled to any relief and that his claim deserves to be dismissed. Issues are answered accordingly and hence the order :—

ORDER

Workman Harishchandra Vithu Bhosale was on contract basis therefore question of his termination

does not arise and that he voluntarily abandoned the work therefore he is not entitled to any relief.

S. N. SAUNDANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 मई, 2003

का.आ. 1673.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधतान्त्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकारण कम-लेबर कोर्ट, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी. नं. 26 ऑफ 99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22-05-2003 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-12011/25/98-आई.आर.(बी-I)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd May, 2003

S.O. 1673.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (I. D. No. 26 of 99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Kanpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 22-5-2003.

[No. L-12011/25/98-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SURESH CHANDRA PRESIDING
OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT
SARVODAYA NAGAR, KANPUR U.P.

Industrial Dispute No. 26 of 99

In the matter of dispute between

The Deputy General Secretary State Bank of India
Karanchari Sangh B-4/20, Hanumanghat, Varanasi.

And

The Deputy General Manager
State Bank of India
Zonal Office Varanasi.

AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, vide its notification No. L-12011/25/98-IR(B.I) dated 15th February 1999, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Zonal Office, Varanasi, in deducting the

subscription in the name of rival union without obtaining proper authorisation is correct or not ? If not to what relief the concerned union is entitled ?

2. The case of the concerned union in short is that the management vide staff circular No. 96 of 1989 circulated on 20-11-89 to its all branches under Lucknow Circle extending the facility of check off with its enclosures of authorisation letter format valid for atleast one year effective from January to December of the year. The union has further alleged that the branch managers of the opposite party management bank deliberately to strengthen the rival union and to weaken the union raising the present dispute have violated the above instructions by deducting the union subscription of its members without taking the prescribed authorisation letter and remitted the fund in favour of the rival union. It has been further alleged that the management is putting due pressure over the members of the union raising the present industrial dispute for not opposing their action. The union has further alleged that the rival union either on the pressure of the management or otherwise sent a computerised list of employees containing the list/ names of members of applicant union as well as members of rival union i.e. State Bank of India Staff Association Lucknow Circle to each and every branch of Lucknow Circle for remitting union's subscription in their favour and on that basis the branch managers/officials under control of management deducting the union's contribution of applicant's members too and remitting the amount so deducted from the members of the applicant union in favour of rival union. The union alleges that it objected the unlawful act of the management resulting that the present dispute has arisen. It is alleged by the union that the management bank has deducted the contribution of its members viz. Sri Rant Nihor, Sri Ajai Kumar, Sri Laxman Tiwari, Sri Purushottam Tiwari, and so many other members in favour of rival union. It has further been alleged that the action of the management bank is against bank's instructions and is discriminatory and is clear unfair treatment with the applicant union to weakened the union raising the present dispute. The act of the management has lowered the image of the union in the eyes of its own members as well as others who are having soft corner with the applicant union. On the basis of the above pleadings it has been prayed that the management bank be directed to follow staff circular No. 96/89 and the union's contribution remitted in favour of the rival union may be directed to be remitted in favour of the applicant union.

3. The management bank contested the claim of the union and has filed written statement wherein it has been alleged that the allegation of strengthening the rival union

is baseless. It is alleged that the management has never violated the staff circular No. 96/89 and the claim in this regard is unfounded. Management bank has further alleged that the claimant had raised the dispute before the ALC(C) Allahabad which was later on withdrawn by the claimant union hence the issue regarding strengthening the rival union is beyond the scope of reference order. It has been alleged by the bank that as per provisions of the said circular the employees of the bank give their authorisation and the deduction is made on the basis of the said authorisation and the details of the authorisation is mentioned in LPC and the deductions are made on the basis of the same. The claimant union failed to mention any instance where the authorisation was given in favour of the applicant union. It has further been pleaded by the management bank that the claimant union has not disclosed the details of years and the details of authorisation letter issued by the members of applicant union names of which have been mentioned in their statement of claim. It has been alleged that the authorities of the bank are following the instructions of the circular under reference since date of its issuance. In the end it has been prayed that the claim of the applicant union be rejected being devoid of merit and the action of the management be held as just and proper by this Tribunal.

4. After exchange of pleadings between the parties case was taken up for evidence of union on 6-2-02 and when none appeared from the side of the union, the union was debarred from adducing evidence in support of its case. Thereafter, case was fixed for management's evidence and the management too was debarred from adducing its evidence as the management failed to lead evidence on 1-4-2002. Ultimately the case was taken upon 2-5-03 for hearing arguments in the case. None appeared from the side of the union whereas Sri S. N. Sharma authorised representative for the management was present who advanced his arguments in the case.

5. I have gone through the file carefully and I am of the opinion that virtually it is a case in which none have adduced their evidence in support of their respective case. In view of it this tribunal is left with no other option but to decide the reference holding that the union is not entitled to any relief for want of proof in pursuance of the present reference.

6. Accordingly it is held that the union raising the present dispute is not entitled for any relief pursuant to the present dispute for want of evidence and proof.

7. Reference is answered accordingly

SURESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer